

NEW YORK

Clara F. Wood to be postmaster at Angola, N. Y., in place of C. N. Wood, deceased.

Vincent Phelps to be postmaster at Briarcliff Manor, N. Y., in place of C. H. Whitson, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John A. Nannestad to be postmaster at Brandt, S. Dak., in place of H. E. Kjenstad, removed.

WISCONSIN

Fred S. Bell to be postmaster at Mosinee, Wis., in place of E. V. Snider, deceased.

Fora G. DuBois to be postmaster at North Freedom, Wis., in place of H. N. Apker. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1929.

WEST VIRGINIA

James R. Wratford to be postmaster at Moorefield, W. Va., in place of E. M. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expired January 2, 1929.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, *March 1, 1929*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We give thanks to Thee, Blessed Father, for all the supplies of love and grace; we praise Thee for the bountiful hand that gives them, and may we strive to use them for Thy glory. Let not the burdens of care, the vicissitudes of business, or any disappointments daze or leave us uncertain as to the performance of our duty. Be our sovereign guide, our bread of life, and the rock of our salvation; we find in Thee the true life, calm and safe. O Lord unsettle the foundations of every iniquitous agency, put to naught every wicked thing, and bless the endeavors of those who seek the good with simplicity and earnestness. Direct us to harken unto Thy statutes, walk in the ways of Thy commandments, and keep our expectant lives toward the rising sun of hope and promise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1625. An act to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Myron C. Bond, Guy M. Caffin, and Edwin A. Wells;

H. R. 2137. An act for the relief of Ed. Snyder, William Paddock, Ed. Strike, and A. S. Heydeck;

H. R. 2659. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lizenby;

H. R. 3044. An act for the relief of Leon Freidman;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of William F. Goode;

H. R. 3677. An act for the relief of F. M. Gray, Jr., Co.;

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Robert C. Osborne;

H. R. 4029. An act for the relief of Maude A. Sanger;

H. R. 4215. An act for the relief of Frank L. Merrifield;

H. R. 4264. An act for the relief of Philip V. Sullivan;

H. R. 4440. An act for the relief of Frederick O. Goldsmith;

H. R. 4611. An act for the relief of Marion M. Clark;

H. R. 4626. An act for the relief of Maj. Arthur A. Padmore;

H. R. 5264. An act for the relief of James P. Cornes;

H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Roland M. Baker;

H. R. 5341. An act for the relief of the Staunton Brick Co.;

H. R. 5399. An act for the relief of George Heitkamp;

H. R. 7173. An act granting compensation to the daughters of James P. Gallivan;

H. R. 7230. An act for the relief of Charles L. Dewey;

H. R. 7330. An act for the relief of E. M. Gillett and J. H. Swenarton;

H. R. 7552. An act for the relief of Bertina Sand;

H. R. 7930. An act to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve";

H. R. 7976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Moore L. Henry;

H. R. 8223. An act to authorize the sale of certain buildings at United States Veterans' Hospital No. 42, Perry Point, Md.;

H. R. 8423. An act for the relief of Timothy Hanlon;

H. R. 8598. An act for the relief of James J. Dower;

H. R. 8886. An act for the relief of Luc Mathias;

H. R. 8987. An act for the relief of John R. Butler;

H. R. 9530. An act for the relief of W. L. Inabnit;

H. R. 9546. An act for the relief of T. D. Randall & Co.;

H. R. 9862. An act for the relief of M. T. Nilan;

H. R. 9972. An act for the relief of Charles Silverman;

H. R. 10045. An act for the relief of Robert S. Ament;

H. R. 10178. An act for the relief of the H. J. Heinz Co., Atlantic City, N. J.;

H. R. 10417. An act for the relief of George Simpson and R. C. Dunbar;

H. R. 10508. An act for the relief of T. P. Byram;

H. R. 11153. An act for the relief of Harry C. Tasker;

H. R. 12126. An act for the relief of Frans Jan Wouters, of Antwerp, Belgium;

H. R. 11500. An act for the relief of Ella Mae Rinks;

H. R. 11508. An act for the relief of Kirby Hoon;

H. R. 12189. An act for the relief of Marie Rose Jean Baptiste, Marius Francois, and Regina Lexima, all natives of Haiti;

H. R. 12198. An act to authorize the exchange of timber with the Saginaw & Manistee Lumber Co.;

H. R. 12359. An act for the relief of the widow of Edwin D. Morgan;

H. R. 12548. An act for the relief of Margaret Vaughn;

H. R. 12867. An act granting an honorable discharge to Pierce Dale Jackson;

H. R. 13132. An act for the relief of J. D. Baldwin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13258. An act for the relief of H. L. Redlingshafer for payments made in official capacity disallowed by the General Accounting Office;

H. R. 13260. An act for the relief of Josiah Harden.

H. R. 13430. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Rump.

H. R. 13521. An act for the relief of Minnie A. Travers.

H. R. 13573. An act for the relief of Pedro P. Alvarez.

H. R. 13869. An act for the relief of John Wesley Clark.

H. R. 13888. An act for the relief of Charles McCoombe.

H. R. 13992. An act for the relief of N. P. Nelson & Co.

H. R. 14242. An act for the relief of Everett A. Dougherty.

H. R. 14663. An act directing that copies of certain patent specifications and drawings be supplied to the public library of the city of Los Angeles at the regular annual rate;

H. R. 14823. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

H. R. 14850. An act for the relief of Leo Byrne;

H. R. 14873. An act for the relief of Chesley P. Key;

H. R. 14897. An act for the relief of Matthias R. Munson;

H. R. 14975. An act for the relief of Capt. William Cassidy;

H. R. 15220. An act for the relief of Francis X. Callahan;

H. R. 15292. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Porter, Okla.;

H. R. 15293. An act for the relief of Lieut. John J. Powers, Quartermaster Corps;

H. R. 15421. An act for the relief of D. B. Heiner;

H. R. 15570. An act authorizing S. R. Cox, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 15717. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Stanton, N. Dak.;

H. R. 15718. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of the county of Lake, State of Indiana, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Grand Calumet River, at or near Lake Street, in the city of Gary, county of Lake, Ind.;

H. R. 15723. An act authorizing an appropriation of Crow tribal funds for payment of council and delegate expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15916. An act to provide for the construction of a new bridge across the South Branch of the Mississippi River from Sixteenth Street, Moline, Ill., to the east end of the island occupied by the Rock Island Arsenal;

H. R. 16126. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of the county of Lake, State of Indiana, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Grand Calumet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Cline Avenue, in the cities of East Chicago and Gary, county of Lake, Ind.;

H. R. 16131. An act to enable the Postmaster General to make contracts for the transportation of mails by air from possessions or Territories of the United States to foreign countries and to the United States and between such possessions or Territories, and to authorize him to make contracts with private individuals and corporations for the conveyance of mails by air in foreign countries;

H. R. 16169. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to accept title to a certain tract of land adjacent to the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal at East Chicago, Ind.;

H. R. 16170. An act authorizing Walter J. Mitchell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Patuxent River south of Burch, Calvert County, Md.;

H. R. 16205. An act authorizing the Fayette City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Fayette City, Fayette County, Pa.;

H. R. 16209. An act to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission, established by act of March 4, 1913, to make slight changes in the boundaries of said parkway by excluding therefrom and selling certain small areas, and including other limited areas, the net cost not to exceed the total sum already authorized for the entire project;

H. R. 16345. An act authorizing Frank A. Augsbury, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Morristown, N. Y.;

H. R. 16382. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

H. R. 16383. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the South Fork of the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

H. R. 16384. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Burkesville, Cumberland County, Ky.;

H. R. 16385. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Canton, Ky.;

H. R. 16386. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smithland, Ky.;

H. R. 16387. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Luka, Ky.;

H. R. 16388. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Eggners Ferry, Ky.;

H. R. 16389. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River;

H. R. 16393. An act to include henceforth, under the designation "storekeeper-gaugers," all positions which have heretofore been designated as those of storekeepers, gaugers, and storekeeper-gaugers; to make storekeeper-gaugers full-time employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16406. An act to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Annie E. Springer;

H. R. 16407. An act to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Lottie A. Bowhall;

H. R. 16423. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Sabine at or near Port Arthur, Tex.;

H. R. 16425. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R. 16426. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Nebraska City, Nebr.;

H. R. 16427. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near the mouth of Indian Creek in Russell County, Ky.;

H. R. 16430. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Kanawha River at a point in or near the town of Henderson, W. Va., to a point opposite thereto in or near the city of Point Pleasant, W. Va.;

H. R. 16431. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge to be built across the Kanawha River at or near Henderson, W. Va., to a point opposite thereto at or near Point Pleasant, W. Va.;

H. R. 16432. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highday Department of the County of Etowah, State of Alabama, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry;

H. R. 16433. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.;

H. R. 16448. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 16499. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near St. Albans, Kanawha County, W. Va.;

H. R. 16531. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Golconda, Ill.;

H. R. 16533. An act to authorize the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, to erect a memorial chapel at the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J.;

H. R. 16603. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Arat, Cumberland County, Ky.;

H. R. 16604. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Center Point, in Monroe County, Ky.;

H. R. 16605. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Creelsboro, in Russell County, Ky.;

H. R. 16606. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Neelys Ferry, in Cumberland County, Ky.;

H. R. 16609. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.;

H. R. 16610. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Randolph County, Ill.;

H. R. 16640. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mound City, Ill.;

H. R. 16641. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Washington, Mo.;

H. R. 16645. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Helena, Ark.;

H. R. 16659. An act to authorize an appropriation to pay one-half the cost of a bridge on the Cheyenne River in the State of South Dakota;

H. R. 16660. An act to authorize an appropriation to pay one-half the cost of a bridge on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation in South Dakota;

H. R. 16719. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chattanooga and the county of Hamilton, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tenn.;

H. R. 16725. An act authorizing L. L. Thompson, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Montgomery, La.;

H. R. 16791. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Point Marion, Pa.;

H. R. 16818. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.;

H. R. 16824. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.;

H. R. 16867. An act for the relief of H. E. Jones;

H. R. 16985. An act authorizing the Uintah, Uncompahgre, and the White River Bands of the Ute Indians in Utah and Colorado and the Southern Ute and the Ute Mountain Bands of Ute Indians in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico to sue in the Court of Claims;

H. R. 16988. An act to legalize the sewer outlet in the Allegheny River at Thirty-second Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.;

H. R. 17001. An act for the relief of Capt. Walter R. Gherardi, United States Navy;

H. R. 17020. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y.;

H. R. 17023. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near East Alburg, Vt.;

H. R. 17079. An act to repeal the provision in the act of April 30, 1908, and other legislation limiting the annual per capita cost in Indian schools;

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the District of Columbia of a monument or memorial to Oscar S. Straus;

H. J. Res. 399. Joint resolution providing more economical and improved methods for the publication and distribution of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and supplements; and

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution providing for an investigation of Grover M. Moscovitz, United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 2425. An act for the relief of Annie McColgan;
- H. R. 3737. An act for the relief of John T. O'Neill;
- H. R. 4244. An act for the relief of Joseph Lee;
- H. R. 4265. An act for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, and for other individual claims approved by the War Department;
- H. R. 9014. An act for the relief of Anthony Mullen;
- H. R. 9966. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain patients at the United States veterans' hospital, Sunmount, N. Y., for loss and damage to personal effects;
- H. R. 10274. An act for the relief of Commander Francis James Cleary, United States Navy;
- H. R. 10431. An act to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

H. R. 12106. An act to create a national military park at Cowpens battle ground;

- H. R. 12475. An act for the relief of Alfred L. Diebolt, sr., and Alfred L. Diebolt, jr.;
- H. R. 12650. An act for the relief of John F. Fleming;
- H. R. 13936. An act to amend the second paragraph of section 4 of the Federal farm loan act, as amended;
- H. R. 14728. An act for the relief of J. A. Smith;
- H. R. 15387. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia";

H. R. 16082. An act to authorize the disposition of unplatted portions of Government town sites on irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 17026. An act granting a part of the Federal building site at Savannah, Ga., to the city of Savannah for street purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 119. An act for the relief of C. C. Moore & Co., engineers;
- S. 801. An act to place Dr. Charles H. DeLancey on the retired list of the Navy as a lieutenant commander;
- S. 2127. An act for the relief of William S. Welch, trustee of the estate of the Joliet Forge Co., Joliet, Ill., bankrupt;
- S. 3027. An act to increase the pay of mail carriers in the village delivery service;

S. 3572. An act authorizing an appropriation for the purpose of defraying expenses incident to the making of a comprehensive survey covering the requirements of a Federal penal system;

- S. 3691. An act for the relief of Charles W. Townsend;
- S. 4237. An act for the relief of Antoine Laporte, alias Frank Lear;

S. 4308. An act for the relief of Maj. H. E. Miner, Capt. A. J. Touart, Capt. J. L. Hayden, Capt. H. H. Pohl, First Lieut. C. C. Jadwin, and First Lieut. F. B. Kane, United States Army;

S. 4336. An act for the relief of D. B. Traxler, president of the Realty Corporation, of Greenville, S. C.;

S. 4354. An act for the relief of Atlantic Refining Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, owner of the American steamship *H. C. Folger*, against the U. S. S. *Connecticut*;

S. 4661. An act to place Norman A. Ross on the retired list of the Navy;

S. 4681. An act for the relief of Gilbert Peterson;

S. 4796. An act for the relief of Jesse J. Britton;

S. 4809. An act for the relief of John B. Meisinger and Nannie Belle Meisinger;

S. 4825. An act for the relief of August R. Lundstrom;

S. 4907. An act for the relief of August Mohr;

S. 5017. An act for the relief of Cullen D. O'Bryan and Lettie A. O'Bryan;

S. 5056. An act for the relief of William B. Thompson;

S. 5202. An act to provide for the establishment of a branch home of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers in the State of Florida;

S. 5332. An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries;

S. 5365. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oregon and the Haynes Slough Drainage District to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into Haynes Slough, Coos Bay, Coos County, Oreg.;

S. 5386. An act extending benefits of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, to John J. Helms;

S. 5472. An act to amend the immigration act of 1924, as amended, with regard to the issuance of immigration visas, and for other purposes;

S. 5493. An act relating to the construction of a chapel at the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va.;

S. 5555. An act to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 5616. An act to enable the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans;

S. 5677. An act to amend section 2 of the act, chapter 254, approved March 2, 1927, entitled "An act authorizing the county of Escambia, Fla., and/or the county of Baldwin, Ala., and/or the State of Florida, and/or the State of Alabama to acquire all the rights and privileges granted to the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co. by chapter 168, approved June 22, 1916, for the construction of a bridge across Perdido Bay from Lillian, Ala., to Cummings Point, Fla.";

S. 5679. An act for the relief of Charles N. Neal;

S. 5715. An act for the relief of J. H. B. Wilder;

S. 5730. An act to supplement the last three paragraphs of section 5 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1161), as amended by the act of March 21, 1918 (40 Stat. 458);

S. 5740. An act to legalize a bridge across St. Johns River 2½ miles southeast of Green Cove Springs, Fla.;

S. 5781. An act to provide an appropriation for the payment of claims of persons who suffered damages from deaths, personal injuries, or property loss due to an airplane accident at Langin Field, Moundsville, W. Va., July 10, 1921;

S. 5824. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River at or near Ashland Avenue, in Cook County, State of Illinois;

S. 5825. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Arkansas City, Ark.;

S. 5834. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Arrow Rock, Mo.;

S. 5835. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near St. Charles, Mo.;

S. 5836. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.;

S. 5837. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

S. 5843. An act to provide for the relocation of Michigan Avenue adjacent to the southerly boundary of the United States Soldiers' Home grounds, and for other purposes;

S. 5844. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Tenth Street in Bettendorf, State of Iowa;

S. 5845. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Kentucky & Ohio Terminal Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Ohio River near Cincinnati, Ohio;

S. 5858. An act authorizing the New Harmony Bridge Co., its successors and assigns (or his or their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind.;

S. 5860. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of the marine biological station at Key West, Fla.; and S. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to create a commission on a memorial to the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 1781. An act to establish load lines for American vessels, and for other purposes; and

S. 2366. An act to amend subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to degree-conferring institutions.

The message also announced that the Senate concurs in the following resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 60

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint three Senators and the Speaker of the House to appoint three Members of the House of Representatives to cooperate with the New Bern Historical Society and a committee of the North Carolina Legislature in the observance of certain historical events which occurred during the colonial and Revolutionary period at New Bern, N. C.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we are now definitely given to understand that an extra session will be convened in April to consider farm-relief legislation and tariff readjustments to make such legislation effective. It is one of the most heartening assurances that could possibly be given. When Mr. Hoover made his now historic announcement that if elected he would call an extra session of Congress to deal with the agricultural problem, many considered it merely a campaign statement made in the heat of an unprecedented political contest and involving no definite obligation. And that conclusion seemed particularly plausible in view of the condition precedent with which he prefaced it—

provided the subject is not disposed of at the short session.

That members of the candidate's own party found room for that interpretation is shown by the fact that from the first day of this session until recently, when the intention of the President elect became too obvious to be longer misunderstood, administration leaders in both House and Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture, and President Coolidge himself have insisted that some species of farm bill be rushed through before March 4 in order to relieve the incoming administration from any embarrassment incident to requests for the redemption of that promise. Even some Members of the House, who had borne the heat and burden of the day in the fight for the McNary-Haugen bill, were temporarily stampeded and joined in the hue and cry for "some kind of a bill."

But it is now evident that Mr. Hoover meant what he said; that his campaign pledge to the farmers of the country was not merely "molasses to catch flies" but was made with a comprehensive understanding of the critical problems with which agriculture has been struggling for the last eight years and with a sincere desire to assist in their early and permanent solution. At least, we must accept that view until some proof is adduced to the contrary.

How accurately Mr. Hoover interprets, and how completely he accepts the farmer's point of view in calling an extra session, is shown by reference to the resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation at its annual convention at Chicago last December. The Farm Bureau said at that time:

Surplus control legislation and agricultural tariffs can not be made major features of the second session of the Seventieth Congress, since time is not available in a short session of Congress adequately to correlate and dispose of these subjects in the proper manner. Both such major legislative projects should be considered at an extra session of the Seventy-first Congress, which we confidently expect will be called soon after adjournment of the Seventieth Congress.

It is one of the hopeful signs of the times that after eight years of delay and obstruction we are to have at last an administration which proposes to consider respectfully the recommendations of the farm organizations in the formulation of farm legislation. And still more encouraging is the fact that not only Mr. Hoover but practically every Representative returned from a rural district, whether Democrat or Republican, also pledged himself during the campaign to an earnest effort to place agriculture on a plane of economic equality with industry and labor.

It is not a partisan question. The McNary-Haugen bill, which in the last three Congresses was the acid test of farm interest, was supported by practically the same proportion of members of both political parties. Mr. Secretary Henry C. Wallace, unquestionably the greatest Secretary of Agriculture to hold that high office under any administration, ardently championed the principles embodied in that bill, while Mr. Secretary Jardine has just as ardently opposed them. There are men on both sides of the aisle ready and anxious to cooperate with Mr. Hoover in practical and effective farm legislation. And there are men on either side of the aisle who if they had their way would have Congress adjourn and go home and stay there until the regular session next December, leaving the farmer in the same precarious situation he occupies to-day. It is not a question of party polity. Friends of farm relief on this side as well as on that side of the aisle are ready to cooperate wholeheartedly and unreservedly with Mr. Hoover in the solution of what he termed in his speech in St. Louis last November—

The most urgent economic problem in our Nation to-day.

And as serious as the problem was when Mr. Hoover made that sweeping statement, it is even more serious and more urgent to-day. Every year for the last eight years professional optimists and administration apologists have assured us that the agricultural depression was past. Every year they have told us that farm conditions were improving. No report emanating from the Department of Agriculture; no bulletin issued by the business associations, commercial agencies, or industrial organizations of the country; no financial summary carried by the metropolitan papers has been complete without an enthusiastic

deduction that farm conditions were growing steadily better. Continuously throughout the past eight years trade journals and political and commercial publicists representing interests profiting at the expense of the farmer have busily disseminated trade reports, news articles, editorials, cartoons, and other propaganda insisting that farm conditions were back to normal and the industry was again on a basis of rapidly increasing returns.

Let us look at these rosy reports of farm prosperity in the cold light of statistics compiled by the most unsympathetic agency in the world—the United States Department of Agriculture. What do the actual balance sheets show?

A summary just issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shows that since 1919, while the index number representing industrial wages has risen 52 points, the index number representing the price of agricultural commodities has fallen 29 points. The rise of industrial wages and the fall of agricultural income have been simultaneous throughout these eight years, and at the close of December, 1928, this phenomenal drop in farm prices and this unprecedented rise in industrial wages are still in operation. Union labor is still getting more and more and the farmer is still getting less and less. During the year 1928, just reported, wages have risen from an index number of 230 to 237, an increase of 7 points, and farm prices have fallen from the index number of 137 to 134, a loss of 3 points. Instead of improving every year, as these prosperity howlers would have us believe, the agricultural situation grows continuously worse.

And during these eight years, while the farmer's income has steadily declined, his cost of living and his costs of production have just as persistently increased. Farm taxes rose from an index number of 130 in 1919 to 254 in 1927, and in the last 12 months the price of essential commodities bought by the farmer rose from 154 to 157. In other words, the less the farmer receives the more he is required to pay; the less he has the more is exacted of him.

To him that hath shall be given; and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

Land values representing the farmer's capital investment have declined without a pause for the last eight years and are still declining. The farmer's share in the national income has been shrinking for eight years and is still shrinking. The farm-mortgage debt, the number of farm foreclosures, and the number of rural bank failures have been just as steadily increasing and are increasing to-day. And this at a time when labor and industry are prospering as they have never prospered before.

Note the contrast. The total farm assets of the United States decreased \$30,000,000,000 between 1920 and 1925, while the total industrial assets of the United States increased \$58,000,000,000 during the same period. These are official figures based on the returns from the 1925 census. Interest on the farmers' capital investment declined from 4.3 per cent for the year 1925-26 to 2 per cent for the year 1926-27, while average earnings of all corporations on total capital investments, water and all, for that year were 13 per cent. Farm lands, after declining every year since 1919, involving a total loss in excess of \$21,000,000,000—as incredible as that may seem—and after apparently reaching bedrock prices at the close of 1927, further declined 2 per cent in 1928.

And the loss continues. The Department of Agriculture reported on February 4 of this year that the decline in the general level of farm prices had continued over into 1929, and that the index figure representing farm prices fell from 134 on December 1, 1928, to 133 on January 15 last. On February 4, 1929, the index number was still lower. And this after eight years of falling markets.

The desperate plight in which the farmer finds himself—through no fault of his own—is all the more striking by contrast with industrial conditions. The New York City Bank in its summary for 1928, issued last week, says:

Never before has a nation made such progress in the accumulation of wealth in so short a time as has the United States since 1921.

And that is undoubtedly true; but what about the farmer during this marvelous period of universal prosperity? During that period the farmers of the country suffered the unparalleled loss of one-third of their property values, one-third of their invested capital assets. Suppose the railroads or the banks or any other industry had suffered the loss of one-third of their capital assets during those eight years. Can you imagine Congress sitting here and discussing the subject as placidly and as impotently as we have discussed the farmer's loss these last eight years? Carrying the analogy still further, the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue after tabulating the income statistics of the Nation announces that labor and industry are to-day enjoying the highest standards of living ever attained in this or any other country. So emphatic a statement from

such a source merits more than passing attention. And it is amply supported by reports from every other authoritative source. Industrial wages per capita are higher and hours of labor per day and per week are shorter in America to-day than ever before in the history of any people or any country since industrial statistics have been tabulated. But the economic position of the farmer, the purchasing power of his products, the wages received for his labor, and the return on his invested capital have declined year by year until the standard of living on the American farm has fallen to the irreducible minimum.

Now, let us not mistake the farmer's position. The farmer has no criticism to make of either labor or industry. The farmer believes in high wages and high prices. He would not take a penny from the wages of labor or from the returns of industry. But he does contend that if he must pay labor a high wage for its services and industry a high price for its products he, too, is entitled to a living wage for his labor and a fair price for his products.

He believes that a dollar invested in farm land and equipment is as sacred as a dollar invested in factories, public utilities, or rolling stock, and that an hour's honest labor on the farm is as much entitled to remuneration as an hour's labor in the shop or on the railroad. He maintains that if Congress has enacted laws under which labor has raised wages, and laws under which industry has increased prices, he, likewise, is entitled to legislation giving him the same right and placing him in a plane of economic equality with both labor and industry. He has been in dire need of that legislation for the last eight years, and he is in more desperate need of it now than ever before. For as drastic as has been the decline in farm assets reported by Federal agencies, such reports do not yet represent the full measure of the farmer's loss. Not only have his lands declined in market value, but their actual and intrinsic worth has depreciated even more rapidly through his lack of means with which to maintain them. Farm improvements which have required generations of successful farming to build are falling into irremediable decay. Lack of money with which to supply livestock, legumes, lime, and fertilizer; lack of respite from fixed charges in which to rotate crops; lack of labor to protect from erosion and predatory pests; the loss not only of surface fertility but of irreplaceable subsoils are alike combining to desolate vast areas of once fertile farm lands beyond hope of redemption.

As you travel through the country and see farms once prosperous and productive now washed and torn by erosion and neglect, gullied and depleted beyond possibility of reclamation, you realize that here in America we have accomplished by legislative discrimination what has been effected in Russia by revolution and confiscation. In prospering the city at the expense of the country, in denying the farmer the means with which to maintain his land we are exploiting and consuming just as effectively and just as ruthlessly the agricultural assets of our own country. In practically every community there are farms which have been so completely desolated in the last eight years that no amount of intelligent care and no expenditure of money can bring them back to the state of productivity they occupied in 1919. They have been permanently charged off the books of our national assets.

And farm resources have been still further impaired. In 1919 real estate was the highest form of collateral the farmer could offer in applying to his bank for credit. Notes secured by mortgages on farm land constituted the safest and most approved type of investment in which banks and insurance companies kept their surplus funds. To-day land is no longer acceptable collateral. There are few rural banks at which loans can be secured on farm lands. State finance departments frown on real-estate loans and sharply criticize their acceptance. Insurance companies have definitely withdrawn from the land-mortgage market. And the curtailment of farming operations through failure of the farmer to secure loans to tide him over the crop season or feeding period is the rule rather than the exception. Legislative discrimination has not only destroyed farm wealth and reduced farm income, but it has just as effectively depleted farm credit.

And having exploited farm lands and farm credits we are now beginning the exploitation of the farmers themselves. So stringent are farm conditions that the average family of the Central West is no longer able to provide standard educational advantages for its children. The enrollment and attendance of agricultural schools has everywhere declined. Young men and young women who should be taking agricultural courses and preparing themselves for the scientific management of the industry—farm boys and girls who should be in training for social and industrial leadership in agricultural communities—are denied that opportunity because agriculture is bankrupt. Too often the able and ambitious are being forced into other

industries and the incompetent and ne'er-do-well are left on the farm. It is not merely a farm disaster; it is a national disaster. It is a situation which must inevitably be reflected throughout the land. No nation can starve an industry without eventually feeling the effects of that discrimination in every artery of trade. And agriculture has been slowly starving year by year for eight years. Not only has she failed to make a reasonable profit in a period of extraordinary profits for all other industries; not only has she lost one-third of all she possessed, but the loss has been spiritual and ethical as well as financial and material. The very calling is being stigmatized. For the last eight years it has been an economic anathema. Although from earliest times it has been the noblest profession to which men may aspire, under present conditions it is becoming synonymous with poverty and provincialism.

It is this situation—a situation growing daily more urgent—which Mr. Hoover proposes to make the first care of his administration. By what method he hopes to alleviate that situation has been the subject of much speculation and surmise. Up to this time he has made no announcement as to his personal views, but it may be pertinent to note the viewpoint from which he analyzed a similar problem some years ago in establishing salary schedules at a great university of which he was trustee. In a magazine article published in 1918 describing the incident the narrator relates:

His first question was: "What is the figure below which a professor can not maintain himself on a basis which will not lower his efficiency in his work or his dignity in the community?" We finally agreed on a figure. "Well," said Hoover, "that must be the minimum salary."

If the President elect will approach the pending problem from that sympathetic point of view; if he will advocate a standard of living for the farm commensurate with that enjoyed by other industries, and measured by such standards of efficiency as those prescribed by labor unions and trade guilds, he will have taken a long step towards its solution. In the last eight years the standard of living in the American city has risen by leaps and bounds, while on the farm it has dropped tragically. The farmer, staggered by the collapse of his own prices, finds himself saddled with the added costs of supporting the continually advancing standards of living demanded by labor and industry. In this extremity, ground between the upper and nether millstones of a decreasing income on the one hand and an increasing budget on the other, the farmer is not demanding a lower standard of living for the rest of the country. He is not asking for the repeal of the transportation act, the immigration law, or the protective tariff. He is not suggesting a lower scale of union wages, decreased dividends on stocks, or lowered rates of interest on bonds.

He believes in an American standard of living. And he is asking that his status be raised to the American level; not that the general level be lowered to his. He is asking that some practicable means be found to make up the tremendous annual deficit of \$5,000,000,000 on the American farm, as recommended by officials of the National Industrial Conference Board at Chicago last December; he is asking for a stabilized price for farm products maintained throughout the year, unaffected by imaginary cotton never planted or ginned or by phantom wheat neither sown nor harvested. In brief, he is asking to be taken into the American protective system; asking that he be protected against Asiatic prices for his wheat, South American prices for his corn, and African prices for his cotton, while he pays American prices for all he buys. Development of waterways alone will not accomplish this. Cooperative marketing, unsupplemented, can not bring it about. A Federal board without power to control production and handle farm surpluses can not effect it. But there is a way. Mr. Hoover unerringly pointed out the solution in his speech at St. Louis just before the election last fall, when he said:

The first and most complete necessity is that the American farmer have the American market. That can be assured to him solely through the protective tariff.

Personally, I am not so enamored of prohibitive tariff. It is an arbitrary and artificial interference with economic law. It has been made frequently the instrument of flagrant injustice. But we are confronted to-day by a condition and not a theory. The whole fabric of our industrial system is based on the principle of protection of domestic labor and domestic commerce from foreign competition; on the reservation of American markets for American products. Even if it were desirable, the system can not be changed in a day. All must concede that we face a situation in which there is not the slightest possibility of any appreciable change in the protective system for years to come. Under such circumstances it is futile to argue an academic question while agriculture waits.

In view of this situation, I am constrained to concur in the views expressed by Mr. Henry A. Wallace when he said last December:

I don't think much of tariff as a long-time method of solving the agricultural problem. However, as long as we have a high-tariff party in power which has declared in favor of using the tariff to do justice to agriculture, we might as well follow the example of industry and get what we can. If we fight hard enough to get our fair share of the tariff plunder, it may be that the industrial interests of the United States will wake up to the true significance of the tariff.

It is evident from many indications that the business interests of the Nation are already awakening to its true significance. There are strong indications of a revulsion of sentiment and a growing realization that prohibitive tariffs on foreign goods inevitably react on foreign markets for our own goods. But be that as it may, it is certain that for the present there can be no fundamental change in tariff policies, and we must adapt ourselves to conditions as we find them. In brief, that agriculture must be taken into the protective system and given the benefit of protective tariffs along with other American business interests.

That a bare enactment of tariff schedules for farm products or a mere increase in present tariff rates, without legislative provision to make those tariffs effective would be futile, is self-evident. Tariffs on farm products or any other commodity of which we produce an exportable surplus have no more effect on farm prices than legislative enactments on the rotations of the planets.

For example, on March 6, 1924, the duty on wheat was raised from 30 to 42 cents a bushel. Immediately there was a slump on the Liverpool market, promptly reflected in our domestic market, aggregating 11½ cents in 21 days. No amount of political or theoretical sophistry can controvert the naked testimony of a daily market report. On October 15, 1924, to choose a date at random, during the height of the campaign, when the tariff would have been invoked, if ever, No. 1 hard northern wheat sold at Winnipeg, Canada, without a tariff, for \$1.23½ per bushel. On the same day, at Minneapolis, just across the boundary line in the United States, with a tariff of 42 cents a bushel, it sold for \$1.11½.

Had the tariff been effective the price would have been 42 cents higher in the United States than in Canada for wheat of similar grade and a quotation of \$1.23½ at Winnipeg would have meant a quotation of \$1.65½ at Minneapolis instead of the \$1.11½ for which it actually sold. This is typical. Compare the market reports from Winnipeg and Minneapolis any day in the year and note the utter failure of the tariff to affect farm prices. It is also apparent in the foreign and domestic prices of all other tariff-protected farm products of which we produce a surplus. The Department of Agriculture in a report released January 23, 1929, announced that the decreased estimate of the Argentine corn crop had materially advanced corn prices in the United States. And testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means only a few days ago showed that the price of potatoes in the United States was directly affected by the crop yield of Prince Edward Island. The daily market reports prove conclusively that tariffs on farm products produced in excess of domestic requirements are ineffective to the point of absurdity; so useless and so senseless, in fact, as to reflect gravely on the sincerity and good faith of those who advocate them, and on their estimate of the intelligence and gullibility of those for whose pretended benefit they are proposed.

It is apparent, therefore, that the problem confronting the administration and the Congress is not a question of levying or increasing farm tariffs but a question of making such tariffs effective. The farm slogan is no longer "a tariff for all or a tariff for none," but "an effective tariff for all or a tariff for none."

In other words, tariff and surplus control are inseparable. One is useless without the other. Just what legislative means can be adopted which will include both and thereby provide for a disposition of farm surpluses which will secure maximum benefits of the tariff for agriculture, is still an open question. Whether it be secured through an equalization fee, a commission, a marketing charge, a rebate, or some other method is not particularly material. The sole requirement, the sine qua non, is that it effectuate Mr. Hoover's proposal, "That the American farmer be assured the American market through the protective tariff." That is the farm objective in the coming session of Congress. The administrative details of the plan through which that objective is to be attained are secondary.

It is significant, however, that after eight years of intensive study by economists, financiers, farm organizations, and legislators; after six years of exhaustive debate in which all avenues of approach have been thoroughly explored and charted, no

plan yet has been suggested which so nearly conforms to these requirements as that embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill. It may be that some one will yet offer a plan overlooked in these years of study and investigation which will better control farm surpluses and more adequately assure effective tariffs. If so, it will be most welcome. Neither Congress nor the farm organizations are wedded to the McNary-Haugen bill. If a better bill can be formulated, if a more satisfactory plan can be devised to insure the farmer the benefits of the protective system, it will meet with the wholehearted support of all true friends of farm relief. The resolution adopted by the American Federation of the Farm Bureau at Chicago is explicit on this point. After referring to its indorsement of the McNary-Haugen bill in former Congresses, the federation said:

We are willing to compare legislation which has received our support in the past with that proposed by any other organization. We are also willing to consider these subjects with the forthcoming national administration from time to time to find, if possible, a better way than we have heretofore supported of effectuating adequate control of agricultural surpluses, of protecting and advancing cooperative commodity marketing, and of establishing on our farms the benefits of the American protective system, all of which secure that American standard of living which agriculture and industry alike desire.

And if the farm organizations continue their indorsement of the McNary-Haugen bill until a better bill is written, there is no reason why Congress should not continue its support of the McNary-Haugen principle until a better plan is presented.

The McNary-Haugen bill is the legislative protégé of both parties. It is indubitably a Republican measure. It was first suggested by a Republican Secretary of Agriculture; it was originally drafted by farm leaders who were without exception life-long Republicans; it was perfected and introduced by HAUGEN, of Iowa, one of the elders and leaders of the Republican Party in the House; it was considered and reported favorably by a Republican Committee on Agriculture; and was passed by a Congress in which the Republican Party held an overwhelming majority in both House and Senate. The McNary-Haugen bill is essentially a Republican measure.

And by the same criterion it is a Democratic measure. It had the indorsement and support of every Democratic farm leader who appeared in Washington in behalf of agricultural relief. A majority of the Democrats in both the House and the Senate voted for it on final passage. It was officially indorsed by the Democratic Party at Houston. Here is the Democratic plank on farm relief:

We pledge the party to an earnest endeavor to solve this problem of the distribution of the cost of dealing with crop surpluses over the marketed units of the crop whose producers are benefited by such assistance. The solution of this problem would avoid Government subsidy to which the Democratic Party has always been opposed.

There you have the McNary-Haugen bill in its entirety, lock, stock, and barrel, equalization fee and all.

And last, it is indorsed and advocated by the standard bearer of the Democratic Party. Governor Smith said at Omaha:

As I read the McNary-Haugen bill, its fundamental purpose is to establish an effective control of the sale of exportable surplus with the cost imposed upon the commodity benefited. For that principle the Democratic platform squarely stands, and for that principle I squarely stand.

The McNary-Haugen bill is a Democratic measure, championed and supported by the representatives of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States; by the representatives of the Democratic Party in quadrennial session assembled at Houston; and by the official standard bearer of the Democratic Party in the greatest political campaign ever waged in America. It is essentially a Democratic measure.

And if both parties have fostered and supported the McNary-Haugen bill and the equalization fee for the last four years why should they not support them for the next four years? If an overwhelming majority of both parties in both Houses of Congress voted for the bill and the fee last May, is there any reason why they should not vote for them this coming May? It conforms to Mr. Hoover's plan enunciated at St. Louis. It will make the farm tariff effective. It will assure the American farmer the American market through the agency of the protective tariff.

A majority of the Members of this House, after mature deliberation and detailed study extending over a period of eight years, declared by their recorded votes that they approved the McNary-Haugen bill and believed it to be the most feasible plan of farm relief which has been presented. There has been

no material change in the situation since that vote was taken. The farmer is as much in need of relief to-day as he was then. The same economic laws are in force to-day which were in force last May. And the principles which we advocated in the campaign last fall are as sound now as they have been at any time heretofore. Having supported the bill in the Sixty-ninth and Seventieth Congresses, shall we now face about and oppose it? Are Members of Congress weather vanes, veering with every changing breeze that blows? Are they mere camp followers, trailing political dispensers of largess, and ready to desert any principle "that thrift may follow fawning"? Are they fair-weather friends of the farmer, loud in protestations of loyalty on the stump and on the Chautauqua platform, but ready to seek cover at the approach of the first cloud? Are they band-wagon patriots, without stability, ready to sacrifice conviction to expediency, to climb up beside the bass drum? Are they statesmen or politicians? We said the bill was right and we voted for it in the Sixty-ninth Congress. We said it was still right and we voted for it again in the Seventieth Congress. Is there any tenable reason why we should not be consistent and vote for it a third time in the Seventy-first Congress? If it was economic then, it is economic now. If it was workable then, it is workable now. If it was right then, it is right now. Having put our hand to the plow, shall we now turn back?

It has been contended by opponents of farm relief that the result of the election last November should be interpreted as antagonistic to the McNary-Haugen bill. Such statements usually emanate from those with whom the wish is father to the thought. The election last fall was in no sense of the word a referendum on the McNary-Haugen bill. It is only necessary to glance casually over the election returns to be convinced of the fallacy of this contention. To illustrate, the people of Iowa voted overwhelmingly for the Republican ticket.

Who would say that they were impelled to vote for Mr. Hoover because of their opposition to the McNary-Haugen bill? On the other hand, Massachusetts was carried for the Democratic ticket. Who would contend that the people of Massachusetts voted for Governor Smith because they favored the McNary-Haugen bill? Search through the entire returns for a single indication that the result in any State was influenced in the slightest degree by the attitude of the voters on the question of farm relief. Wisconsin, Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Montana went Republican. And yet the congressional delegations from these States which had voted solidly for the McNary-Haugen bill were returned practically to a man by the same electorate which voted so enthusiastically for Mr. Hoover. Likewise, the States of Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, and Rhode Island voted unanimously against the McNary-Haugen bill in Congress last May and almost as emphatically for the Democratic ticket in the election last November. The idea that the McNary-Haugen bill or the equalization fee had any part in the determination of the last national election is refuted by every rule of political deduction. It is true that some of us desired to make it an issue, but as well have tried to interest a small boy in the midweek prayer meeting with a 3-ringed circus putting on a free performance in town, as to interest the voters last fall in any economic issue, agriculture or otherwise. The vote for President of the United States in the last election was in no respect a vote on the McNary-Haugen bill. There has been no change of attitude on the part of the farmers or of the country at large on the question of farm relief. The need and demand for remedial legislation is as insistent to-day as it was a year ago. The Farmer's Union of America, meeting at Jamestown, N. Dak., on November 17, 1928, just 11 days after the election, with 455 accredited delegates in attendance, passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That we renew our demand for the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill without compromise on the equalization feature.

The tenth annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, meeting at Chicago on December 10, 1928, with 40 State farm bureaus officially represented, and speaking for more than 2,000,000 organized farmers, said:

We reiterate the principles for which we have striven in the past * * * to require all portions of the crop to share in the cost of bringing the crop into the American protective system. * * * This legislation must be of a nature which does not subsidize agriculture. * * * We have seen nothing up to this time which would cause us to recede from our former position.

And practically every other farm organization in the United States, including the Corn Belt committee, unites in this indorsement with increasing emphasis.

It is futile to defer action in the hope that the problem will adjust itself. The situation instead of improving grows every year more acute. Competition of foreign agricultural products

with American agricultural products is increasing. World production of foodstuffs and raw materials is expanding. The United States Department of Agriculture reports that 44 nations have increased their wheat production for 1928 5.4 per cent over that of 1927. The Canadian crop for 1928 was 45,000,000 bushels more than that produced in 1927, and the Dominion embraces vast areas of potential wheat lands yet unutilized. The introduction of power machinery in Argentina, India, Egypt, Australia, and other countries where cheap land and cheap labor are competing with the American farmer, is being pushed vigorously by American manufacturers and is tremendously increasing the pressure on the world markets which fix the price of wheat in America. In Russia especially, one of the greatest wheat-growing countries of all time, the importation of tractors and combines manufactured in the United States, has made it possible for one Russian, working for a pittance, to produce as much wheat as 500 men formerly produced with ox teams and primitive equipment. Competition is growing. The Asiatic coolie, the Russian peasant, and the Argentine peon are throwing an ever-increasing flood of foodstuffs into the markets of the world to compete with the American farmer; to hammer down the price of his products; and to pull his family down to their meager standard of living.

It is to meet this competition, increasing with each crop season, that the farmer asks the enactment of the McNary-Haugen bill. American labor refuses to compete with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia; American industry refuses to compete with foreign industry; and the farmer who is paying the increased prices required for their protection sees no reason why he is not entitled to the same protection against the same enemy. To extend this protection is the purpose and mission of the special session of Congress soon to be convened. Mr. Hoover has assured us that he regards the problem as the supreme challenge of his administration. It is more than that. It is a challenge of the constructive statesmanship of the Congress and of every Member, regardless of section or party. And it should be approached with an open mind and in a spirit of broad and earnest cooperation.

It is difficult to imagine circumstances under which the last six years of study and struggle would go for naught and the bill which twice has been passed by Congress be entirely discarded, but if Mr. Hoover brings forward a measure embodying another but equally effective plan, it should have universal support. The one desideratum is that it make the farm tariff effective. In the words of Abraham Lincoln we should—

Stand with anybody that stands right. Stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

MEMORIAL TO COL. WILLIAM COLVILL

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by inserting as a part of my remarks an address delivered by President Coolidge on July 29, 1928, at Cannon Falls, Minn., in connection with the dedication of a memorial to Col. William Colvill; also the dedicatory address delivered by Lieut. Col. E. C. Clemans, and the new national anthem, America, My Country, as sung by the chorus of the One hundred and thirty-fifth Infantry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing an address delivered by President Coolidge in Minnesota some time ago, together with other matters incident to the occasion. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, to the rural community of Cannon Falls, one of the thriving little cities of Goodhue County, Minn., came President Coolidge and men prominent in State and national affairs, on Sunday, July 29, 1928, to help dedicate a Civil War memorial.

The Nation's Chief Executive, with his charming wife, journeyed several hundred miles to participate at the unveiling of a beautiful memorial to Col. William Colvill, commander of the First Minnesota Regiment in the Civil War.

It is because of the immortal charge during the Battle of Gettysburg—the turning point in the Civil War—that the memory of Col. William Colvill and the First Minnesota lives. Here 263 men, the strength of the regiment at the time, charged the Confederate forces and held them back in the crucial period of the conflict, and only 47 left the field when the combat was over.

The memorial, a beautiful stone, bearing a tablet recounting the history of the First Minnesota, an ornamental stone stairway, leading to the knoll on which Colonel and Mrs. Colvill are buried, and upon which stands a large bronze statue of the war hero, was unveiled by Mrs. Calvin Coolidge and dedicated by President Coolidge and Lieutenant Colonel Clemans.

The memorial to Col. William Colvill was constructed with funds donated individually by officers and men of the One hundred and thirty-fifth Infantry, lineal descendants' organization of the First, in memory of Col. William Colvill, who commanded the First Minnesota United States Volunteer Infantry at the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1 to 3, 1863. With only 262 officers and men, Colonel Colvill, by order of General Hancock, met a victorious onward march of many thousand Confederate troops under the veteran generals, Longstreet and Hill, drove them back with a bayonet charge, and held the enemy until Union forces relieved them. Forty-seven officers and men were able to leave the field; 225 were lying dead or wounded—the greatest proportionate loss of any regiment in the Civil War. The heroic charge of the already decimated regiment is credited with saving the Union Army from defeat and thus making possible a Union victory on the following day. In the final analysis, Colonel Colvill, perhaps, saved not only the Union Army and the day at Gettysburg, but turned back "the high tide of the Confederacy" and saved the Union.

Colonel Colvill was born in Chataqua County, N. Y., in 1830. He was admitted to the bar in 1851, moved to Red Wing, Minn., where he practiced law, and in 1861, as captain in the First Minnesota, entered the Civil War. He was promoted to lieutenant colonel and colonel, and when the regiment was mustered out in 1864 was brevetted brigadier general. He entered the service again as colonel of the First Regiment of Minnesota Heavy Artillery and was mustered out at the close of the war. He served one term as Attorney General. He died June 12, 1905, and was buried at Cannon Falls, Minn.

As a soldier, statesman, and citizen Colonel Colvill gained for himself an immortal name indelibly carved upon the pages of the history of his country. As a neighbor and friend, while he lived in Cannon Falls and Red Wing, he was loved by all. His name and his deeds are history, and the people of Goodhue County are proud to have had him as its leading citizen.

ADDRESS BY HON. CALVIN COOLIDGE, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, DELIVERED AT CANNON FALLS, MINN., ON JULY 29, 1928, IN HONOR OF COL. WILLIAM COLVILL

Fellow citizens: Heroic deeds have about them an element of immortality. We stand in reverence before those who perform them and cherish their memory down through the ages because we recognize in them the manifestation of a spiritual life, the evidence of things not seen, the presence which was without beginning and is without end, a power that lifts men above the things of this earth into the realm of the divine. Except as we cherish a belief in these realities, we should have no requirement for heroic deeds and no reverence for those who do them. Because of their very nature, because a knowledge of them inspires us to higher things, it is altogether fitting that we should assemble on this Lord's Day to reconsecrate ourselves by dedicating a memorial to one of the heroes of the Battle of Gettysburg. Because we believe in the reality of right and truth and justice and recognize the necessity of supporting them with every necessary sacrifice, including life itself, we could not be engaged in any more devotional action than in reverencing the memory of those who have nobly responded to that high conception of eternal duty.

GREAT CAUSE

Heroism is not only in the man but in the occasion. While there is a certain glamour which attaches itself to the peril which the highwayman and the bandit incur in their criminal activities, it is not genuinely heroic. It will not survive analysis. It leads nowhere. Having no moral quality, it provides no inspiration. It is only a counterfeit of the reality. If it is remembered at all, it is not as a blessing but as a curse.

The memorial which we dedicate to-day is not only to the physical courage of men of high character displayed in an hour of great peril but also in behalf of a great cause. There was in their deed no element of selfishness, no hope of personal gain. It stands as an exhibition of pure patriotism, of supreme sacrifice for the integrity of the Union, and the inviolate sovereignty of the Federal Constitution. It is these qualities which bring the great concourse of our citizens to do honor to the action of Colonel Colvill and his regiment more than three score years after the event. That same honor will continue to be paid them not only so long as the Nation which they served shall endure but so long as self-sacrificing devotion to high ideals commends itself to the heart of men.

STORY OF REGIMENT

The story of Col. William Colvill and the First Minnesota Volunteer Infantry is too well known to need extended repetition. When President Lincoln called for volunteers to prevent the dissolution of the Union, this was the first regiment offered for three years' enlistment. It gave valiant service upon many a resolutely contested field, but its most conspicuous record was made at Gettysburg on the second day of that decisive battle. When the forces under the command of General Sickles advanced into action a little after noon, the First Regiment, of which only eight companies were present, numbering 262 men, took the

position they vacated. The overwhelming forces of the Confederates under Longstreet and Hill repulsed and drove back the command of General Sickles and were advancing on the left flank of the Union Army, which was in grave danger of being rolled up in defeat. It was at this juncture that General Hancock ordered this depleted regiment to charge the advancing Confederates.

The gallant First Minnesota, led by Colonel Colvill, at once responded with an impetuosity that broke the first and second line of the enemy, and stopped the advance. When the action was over but 47 men of the 262 who began the charge were still in line. The remaining 215 lay dead or wounded on the field. In all the history of warfare this charge has few, if any, equals and no superiors. It was an exhibition of the most exalted heroism against an apparently insuperable antagonist. By holding the Confederate forces in check until other reserves came up, it probably saved the Union Army from defeat. What that defeat would have meant to the North no one can tell. Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and the whole heart of the North would have been lost. So far as human judgment can determine, Colonel Colvill and those eight companies of the First Minnesota are entitled to rank among the saviors of their country.

HOPE OF HUMANITY

We may well stop to consider on this Sabbath day what Power it was that stationed these men at this strategic point on this occasion, which held so much of the hope of humanity. We can only infer that it was the same power which guided the path of the Mayflower, which gave our country Franklin and Washington, which brought this Northwestern territory into the Union through the miraculous victory of George Rogers Clark at Vincennes and peopled it with a freedom-loving immigration, which raised up Lincoln and Grant, which went to the rescue of liberty in Cuba and on the fields of France. Was it not the same Power which set these men as its sentinels on that July day to guard the progress of humanity? As we behold it all we can but conclude in the words of Holy Writ that, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

The time has come when our whole country can take a more dispassionate view of the long train of events that led up to Appomattox and the new constitutional guaranties of freedom to every inhabitant under our flag. Our national life was begun without any adequate and final declaration of the principle of freedom or demarcation of the line separating the authority of the States and the authority of the Federal Union. Some of the ablest minds of the country honestly differed in their interpretation of our institutions.

As the intensity of opinions and their application to the practical affairs of life of each side developed, they necessarily gave rise to what was described as an irrepressible conflict. That generation of the South found itself involved in a net of circumstances which very much of its best thought undoubtedly deplored, but from which it was totally unable to extricate itself. We can see now that instead of being charged with all the blame, they were in many ways entitled to sympathy. Our country was all involved in a great national tragedy from which it could extricate itself only by an appalling national sacrifice. That tragedy involved both the North and the South. The conditions which brought about the great conflict were national conditions. It was humanly impossible for either section of itself to furnish an adequate solution. If there was to be an extension of freedom under constitutional guaranties it had to be brought about by national action. Any adequate expiation required the cleansing of the heart of the whole Nation. This could not only be accomplished through an immeasurable sacrifice made in the tears of our women and the blood of our men.

GREAT TRAGEDY

When the great tragedy was passed, when the tumult of the conflict had ceased, the North found itself depleted, but the South was entirely prostrated. It was under the necessity of rebuilding its whole social and economic structure. The recovery of the North began more early, because it was not compelled to establish its methods of life and of business on new theories. It was possible to build on the solid foundation that was already laid. In the South it was necessary to go through the long and painful process of erecting an entirely new structure. The old methods of existence and of business had to be discarded and new systems established. This would have been most difficult under any circumstances. Coming at the end of four years of conflict, it was well-nigh impossible. But the task was performed slowly and imperfectly at first, but in recent years with a rapidity that seemed scarcely possible.

The agriculture which had been the dominant activity of the old South was gradually revived. Then came the development of its natural resources of coal, iron, and water power, and the growth of great manufacturing enterprises. Minerals and manufactured products are to-day almost twice the value of its agriculture. Of our overseas commerce nearly 40 per cent of the tonnage is from southern ports. Since 1900 the value of manufactured products increased from about \$1,500,000,000 to about \$9,500,000,000. Capital invested in cotton manufacturing increased from about \$130,000,000 to about \$1,000,000,000. Deposits in banks in the same period have risen from \$700,000,000 to \$7,000,000,000. In public improvements the progress has been very marked. In 1904 less than \$13,000,000 were spent on highways. In 1925 this

amount had reached \$316,000,000. In 1900 only about \$35,000,000 were laid out for public schools. In 1924 this amount had risen to over \$350,000,000. It is perfectly apparent that in progress and prosperity the South is going forward in a way which it could never have done under the old system. It is no wonder that it is referred to now as the new South.

It has been demonstrated that what never could have been created under a condition of servitude is the almost natural result of a condition of freedom. Human nature has been so designed that men are only at their best when they are permitted to live like men. It is when they are released from bondage of the body, given control over their own actions, receive the returns from their own labor, and released from bondage of the mind, so that ignorance and superstition are replaced by education and moral influences that most progress is made toward an enlightened civilization.

Meantime our whole Nation has risen into a new life with unparalleled swiftness. Out of the sacrifices that were made in our war labor was given a new dignity throughout the whole country. Since that time its position has almost constantly improved, until today the value of human effort is recognized in this country by a system of wages and a standard of living never before reached in all past history. We have been taught that it is profitable not only that labor should be free but that it should be well paid. Under that practice our national income advanced from about \$65,000,000,000 in 1921 to about \$90,000,000,000 in 1927. These material results would not have been possible without the spiritual regeneration of our country.

NO HOSTILITY

One result of the war which retarded our national progress for many years was the bitterness, hatred, and sectional animosities that it left in its wake. For many years, both for the North and for the South, these were unfortunately stimulated and kept alive for the political advantage that the sponsors of such action hoped to secure. The time has long since passed when to hold or express such hostile sentiments should ever be permitted to work to the advantage of anyone. Those who resort to them should find that their standing in the public confidence is thereby seriously impaired. While isolated outbreaks may continue to occur in irresponsible quarters, I am firmly convinced that the responsible elements both in the North and the South each look with pride and satisfaction upon the brilliant contribution which the other is making to the national welfare and are just as eager to help the other as they are to help themselves. A notable example of this occurred in the last session of the Congress when the flood-relief measure for the lower Mississippi Valley, which will probably equal in cost the Panama Canal and a very large amount of which will be paid for by Northern States, passed by practically a unanimous vote. The day of sectionalism is passed. We are a united Nation.

It is in accordance with these conceptions that we have come to-day to dedicate this memorial and to rededicate ourselves to the support and preservation of those principles which have been demonstrated through long experience to be sound. We have come to increase our admiration for all that is heroic in life, to express our reverence for those who have made sacrifices for the well-being of their fellow men, to renew our fealty to the Constitution of the United States, to rejoice in the universal freedom which it guarantees, and in the perfect Union which it has created, and, finally, for all these blessings in gratitude and humility to acknowledge our dependence upon the Giver of every true and perfect gift.

AMERICA, MY COUNTRY

(The new national anthem)

By Jens K. Grondahl, Red Wing, Minn.

America, my country, I come at thy call,
I plight thee my troth and I give thee my all;
In peace or in war I am wed to thy weal,
I'll carry thy flag thru the fire and the steel.
Unswayed it floats o'er our peace-loving race,
On sea nor on land shall it suffer disgrace;
In reverence I kneel at sweet liberty's shrine,
America, my country, command, I am thine.
America, my country, brave souls gave thee birth,
They yearned for a haven of freedom on earth.
When proudly thy flag to the winds was unfurled,
There came to thy shores the oppress of the world.
Thy milk and thy honey flow freely for all,
Who takes of thy bounty shall come at thy call;
Who quaffs of thy nectar of freedom shall say:
"America, my country, command, I obey."
America, my country, now come is thy hour,
The Lord God of hosts counts thy courage and pow'r;
Humanity pleads for the strength of thy hand
That peace and good will rule on sea and on land.
Thou guardian of freedom, thou keeper of right,
When liberty bleeds we may trust in thy might;
No more shall the sword and the saber enthral,
America, my country, I come at thy call.

CHORUS

America, my country, I answer thy call,
That freedom may live and that tyrants may fall;
I owe thee my all and my all will I give,
I do and I die that America may live.

DEDICATORY ADDRESS—LIEUT. COL. E. C. CLEMANS

The summer camps of the Minnesota National Guard regiments are named after members of the regiment, who, though dead, yet speak of service and heroism. The camp of this regiment, the One hundred and thirty-fifth Infantry, at Lake City last year was named in loving memory of William Colvill, the colonel of the First Minnesota in the Battle of Gettysburg, the decisive battle of the Civil War. The One hundred and thirty-fifth Infantry has been recognized by the War Department as the lineal successor of the First Minnesota, of Civil War fame, "first," not only in name but the first regiment accepted by President Lincoln for service in the War of the Rebellion. This memorial tablet gives the royal succession: First Minnesota, Civil War; Thirteenth Minnesota, Spanish American War; First Minnesota, Mexican border service; One hundred and thirty-fifth Infantry, World War; and on the battle streamers that adorn the regimental flag you can read the names of battles from 1861 to 1918. Our heroic dead lie on every battle field from Bull Run to the forest of the Argonne in France.

It was suggested at the regimental camp last year that the coming year the regiment, on the encampment Sunday, go in a body to Cannon Falls, and, at the grave of Colonel Colvill, the chaplain of the regiment conduct divine services, and the colonel of the regiment place a wreath upon the grave of the hero of Gettysburg. Col. O. I. Ronningen, the commanding officer of the regiment, immediately appointed a commission, composed of Lieut. Col. E. C. Clemans, Lieut. Col. W. T. Mollison, Maj. R. E. Gillespie, and First Lieutenant Soper to provide for a regimental memorial to be placed on the grave in Cannon Falls. The commission met and organized, erected this memorial with its surrounding steps, walks, and seats of Bedford stone, this bronze tablet giving the glorious, historical succession of one of the most famous regiments in the service of our country. And we have met to-day, honored by the presence of the President of the United States and his wife, these venerable survivors of the First Minnesota, these members of the Grand Army of the Republic, these statesmen, soldiers, and citizens of Minnesota met in patriotic and reverential assemblage to dedicate this memorial.

We dedicate this memorial to the flag of the First Minnesota of the Civil War, presented in April, 1861, to the regiment by the ladies of St. Paul, carried in victorious battle, war worn, bullet riddled, blood stained, its staff broken in two places by the shrapnel of the enemy, spliced with a section of a Confederate flagstaff, emblematical of a reunited North and South; the flag returned with the regiment to St. Paul, after three years gallant service, now resting in the capitol building of our State with not one star lost, not one stripe sullied—"it never touched the ground."

We dedicate this memorial to the members of the First Minnesota, "the brave men living and dead," who never failed to respond to every call of duty; who carried their flag in 23 battles; who, led by Colonel Colvill, shoulder to shoulder, marched to what seemed certain death; who determined to die "to the last man," if need be, to save the day; who charged bayonets and drove back a division of Confederates many times their number; who saved the battle the second day of the Gettysburg fight, in the last analysis saving the United States; who, out of 262 officers and men who went into the fight left 225 dead, wounded, or dying on the field. The First Minnesota, first in name, first in response to President Lincoln's call, first in its dreadful percentage of death at Gettysburg, first in the hearts of the officers and men of the One hundred and thirty-fifth Infantry, first in the hearts of the citizens of Minnesota, and, we trust in time to be, first with other brave regiments in the hearts of the American people.

We dedicate this memorial to the memory of Col. William Colvill, citizen soldier, loyal American, comrade as well as commanding officer, "wounded as wounded" with his men, modest and unassuming, calm and well poised. The brave officer, who, when asked by General Hancock on that bloody second day at Gettysburg whether he could hold back the victorious Confederates until the imperiled left flank of the Union Army could be reinforced replied, "General, to the last man!" To William Colvill, captain, major, colonel, brevet brigadier general, whose massive statue looks down upon us, cast in a metal which but feebly typifies his unflinching courage and bravery, we dedicate this memorial with the fond hope that his life of patriotic service and devotion may inspire us to greater love and service for the flag, which he so greatly loved and for the country he helped so heroically to save.

My comrades of the One hundred and thirty-fifth Infantry, in honoring William Colvill we have honored ourselves. With no help from the outside, you, each one of you, have contributed to make this memorial possible. You have done this with the firm intention to make the people of Minnesota and of the Nation remember the man whose heroic service and sacrifice have been forgotten. Your desire is to make the citizens of this land of ours know what William Colvill did at Gettysburg. And, my comrades, the dedication of this memorial will place his name among the immortal heroes of America. From now on no his-

torian can write the history of America and forget William Colvill. May the memory of this great soldier and his comrades inspire us to greater service and devotion and may we, in peace or war, as citizens of "no mean country" do all we can to preserve our great Republic, born amid weeping prayer, baptized in blood, and consecrated to the sacred cause of liberty and justice for all.

NAMING OF THE CRUISER "LOUISVILLE"

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD touching the announcement of the Secretary of the Navy that the scout cruiser now under construction at the Puget Sound Navy Yard will be christened the *Louisville* in honor of the city of Louisville, in the State of Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, announcement has been made by the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur, that the scout cruiser now under construction at the Puget Sound Navy Yard will be christened and will bear the name *Louisville*, in honor of Kentucky's metropolis.

Since I represent the Louisville district in Congress, I am very grateful and happy over this action. The people of my district, and of the entire Kentucky region, are likewise very grateful and happy. A just and signal honor has been paid them and the city of Louisville.

It is most fitting that this gallant cruiser should be thus named. The city which has been recognized and complimented by this action is most deserving. Something of the history touching this matter may be of interest.

In April, 1927, at Louisville, information came to me from the Washington representative of the Louisville Times, Mr. Lorenzo Martin, that the policy which the Navy Department had in mind touching the naming of the eight new cruisers whose construction had been authorized, might afford the opportunity to secure the naming of one of these cruisers for the city of Louisville. I immediately wired the Secretary of the Navy, urging the claims of Louisville in this connection, and arranged for the sending of similar wires by the mayor and board of trade of the city. A few days afterwards, in Washington, I called on the Secretary and made further representations about the matter. Ever since then it has been my pleasure to continue these efforts. Also during the past few months an intensive campaign has been waged in the like behalf. It was deemed vitally essential that the people of the Louisville community should convince the officials of the Navy Department of their earnest desire that one of these cruisers be named for their city, and that they would appreciate this great compliment, if accorded. In Louisville the mayor and other public officials, the schools and school children, the civic and patriotic clubs and organizations, aided by effective newspaper publicity, in which the Louisville Herald-Post played a very active part, joined in this campaign; while in Washington Senator SACKETT, whose home is in Louisville, and I did everything within our power to cooperate and assist.

Thus the sentiment of the people of Louisville and of the Louisville community was effectively registered in the Navy Department, and important reasons and arguments in behalf of Louisville's claims were emphasized.

Some of these reasons are set forth in a letter I had the honor to address Secretary Wilbur on the subject in November last. I quote from that letter as follows:

Confirming the conversation I have just had with you, I earnestly hope that you may see your way clear to name for my home city of Louisville the cruiser which must shortly be christened.

Louisville has many strong arguments in favor of this proposal. It was founded by the famous conqueror of the Northwest, Gen. George Roger Clark, in 1778; two years later it was incorporated by an act of the Virginia Legislature and formally called Louisville, in honor of Louis XVI of France, whose soldiers were then aiding the American cause in the Revolutionary War.

The city stands at the great falls in the Ohio River, and is the greatest manufacturing center south of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers. It is a splendid city, rapidly growing, and now has a population of more than 350,000.

Louisville was the base of operations of General Clark in his famous expedition to the Northwest during the Revolutionary War, by means of which expedition the great States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin were wrested from British control and permanently brought under the American flag.

The year 1928 marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Louisville, and the christening of this cruiser in honor of the Kentucky metropolis would, when added to the many other reasons, constitute a very happy and appropriate sesquicentennial recognition of the city's settlement and the work of its founder, mainly achieved in 1778, 150 years ago.

Among other considerations urged were the following:

Louisville is one of the most important inland cities of the Nation, and one of the most important of the entire Ohio River Valley region. Not only is it rich in historic and scenic interest, but it is also rich in every other feature of appeal. It is a city of homes, it holds a patriotic and splendid citizenry, and it is soundly progressive. Its financial and business institutions are solidly grounded. It leads the world in a number of important industries. Its hospitality is of the most thorough-going Kentucky brand, and is world famed.

It was a very happy idea, that of naming six of these scout cruisers after some of the more important of our interior cities. The other two have been named for two of our coast cities. By this action millions of our interior populations are brought into closer contact with the American Navy, and come to have a better understanding of its character and significance. Recently—that is to say, on February 23, 1929—I had the pleasure of accompanying Secretary Wilbur and other distinguished members of our Naval Establishment from Washington to Camden, N. J., to witness there the launching of one of these eight cruisers now under construction. This is the *Salt Lake City*, a sister ship of the vessel to be christened the *Louisville*. The launching was splendidly inspiring, and the fine patriotic address delivered by Secretary Wilbur on that occasion appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1929, in my extension of remarks upon the occasion of this launching. As indicated by the Secretary in that address, the *Salt Lake City* is the first of the eight scout cruisers now being constructed. That which is building at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, and which will bear the name *Louisville*, is the last of the eight. All of these vessels in tonnage, design, and armament will be practically identical in character. Hence, the *Louisville* will be of 10,000 tons displacement, with a length of 585½ feet, and a beam, or maximum width, of 65 feet. It will have an estimated speed of 32½ knots per hour. Also, it will carry nine 8-inch guns, and will have engines capable of developing more than 100,000 horsepower. This vessel is known as cruiser No. 28. It is expected that its hull will be completed about March, 1930, and its launching and formal christening will thereupon take place. This will be followed by the installation of engines, machinery, and armament, and it should be ready for service about March or April, 1931.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I desire now to extend to each and every one of you the heartiest possible invitation to attend the launching and christening of this gallant ship.

I quote from Secretary Wilbur's Camden address the following portions which bear on the subject of the construction of these cruisers:

The launching of the *Salt Lake City* is significant, as it is the first post-treaty cruiser to be launched by the United States. Its tonnage and its armament are limited by a treaty with the great naval powers. If we were to build the type of cruiser most needed by the United States its tonnage would be 40,000 instead of 10,000 tons, and its guns would discharge 2,100-pound projectiles instead of 250 pounds, such as the *Saratoga*, which was building in this yard at the time of the limitation of naval armament, one of whose guns was vastly more powerful than all of the guns of the *Salt Lake City* combined. The war and the Washington treaty left us with an unbalanced fleet. This was because of the exigencies due to the submarine war. We abandoned cruiser construction and devoted all our shipbuilding activities to the construction of a vast merchant marine, which we expected to be sunk by submarines, and a great number of destroyers and submarines to protect our transports and the allied merchant marine. We still have these destroyers and submarines, but with the lapse of time they are rapidly approaching obsolescence.

The treaty of Washington required us to scrap all our partly completed battle cruisers, as well as our uncompleted battleships, except the *West Virginia* and the *Colorado*, now with the fleet. We did complete ten 6-inch gun cruisers, and this represents our entire cruiser strength of vessels under 20 years of age.

Notwithstanding our shortage in cruisers we have proceeded hesitantly, and even reluctantly, to build new cruisers, not because they are not urgently needed, but because we hoped that either by our example or by further limitation the cost of naval armament to the naval powers might be further reduced.

Other powers to the treaty—Great Britain, Japan, France—however, proceeded to round out their fleets by the construction of the much needed cruisers. We are about to launch our first 8-inch gun cruiser. Great Britain has launched 16 (counting four 7½-inch), Japan 8, France 2, completed. We should regard this construction by these powers as evidence of the greatest possible weight as to the value of and the need of cruisers in national defense. Those who are unwilling to accept the evidence and the judgment of our own officials charged under the Constitution with our national defense, those who discount the official declarations of the President and of his Navy Department, should be persuaded by this tangible evidence, the best possible proof,

by other naval powers, as to such need. Nor are we driven to the necessity of inference from actual cruiser construction, however plain and manifest that inference, but we have the most formal and solemn statement of British needs, made in friendly conference at Geneva, that she needs, must have, and is constructing with all reasonable diligence 600,000 tons of cruisers.

The unanimous testimony of all naval authorities thus agrees to the positive need of cruisers.

In this general connection it is interesting to note the fact that while at present no naval vessel of the United States bears the name *Louisville*, during the World War there was a cruiser which carried this name; and during that critical period that ship made many interesting and hazardous trips between American and European ports and in a large way operated in the submarine and mine-infested waters of the European zones. It was retired from naval service shortly after the close of the World War. Before that time it had also known distinguished naval service in the Spanish-American War, bearing the name *City of St. Louis*. Later, under the same name, it became a trans-Atlantic liner, and thus operated until the United States entered the world conflict when, as already indicated, it became a craft of the United States Navy, bearing the name *Louisville*.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the present Congress has enacted the necessary legislation authorizing the construction of 15 additional scout cruisers of the same character as the 8 already mentioned; and necessary appropriations for the beginning of this additional program of construction have been made during this session. Thus, within a few years our Navy will be increased by the total of 23 new scout cruisers.

Of the 15 additional cruisers just authorized, the first 5 will be of the same tonnage, horsepower, and dimensions as the 8 cruisers now under construction.

The armament of these 5 cruisers will each include nine 8-inch guns, just as will be the case with 6 of the 8 cruisers now building; that is to say, No. 26, No. 27, No. 28, No. 29, No. 30, and No. 31. Of the indicated 8 cruisers, the *Pensacola* and *Salt Lake City*, No. 24 and No. 25, respectively, though identical with the 6 remaining cruisers of the 8 in all other respects, will each carry ten 8-inch guns, instead of 9, as will be the case with the other 6 of this group of 8. The remaining 10 cruisers of the 15 just authorized it is expected will be of the same tonnage, general dimensions, horsepower, and armament as the first 5 of the group of 15; subject, however, to such modifications of machinery and equipment as improved processes and discoveries may warrant.

The eight cruisers now under construction will bear the names: *Pensacola*, in honor of Pensacola, Fla.; *Salt Lake City*, in honor of Salt Lake City, Utah; *Northampton*, in honor of Northampton, Mass.; *Chester*, in honor of Chester, Pa.; *Chicago*, in honor of Chicago, Ill.; *Houston*, in honor of Houston, Tex.; *Augusta*, in honor of Augusta, Ga.; and *Louisville*, in honor of Louisville, Ky.

The citizens of Louisville and of the Louisville region not only account themselves signally honored because this new cruiser will bear the name *Louisville*, but they deem themselves and their city as being also most highly honored by reason of the fact that so many other splendid cities of the country were friendly, but unsuccessful, rivals and contenders. Great credit is due to those who have cooperated in the effort to secure this favorable action by the Navy Department, and who have aided in the popular campaign to bring forth, and to register with naval officials, the interest of the people of the Louisville community in behalf of the claims of the city. This campaign was excellently conducted, and now that the movement to secure the naming of one of the eight cruisers in honor of the city of Louisville has been crowned with success, the Louisville community, in a collective way, is most grateful to all of those individuals, officials, agencies, and organizations that have cooperated to bring about this result.

Also, the thanks of the Louisville community are especially due to the distinguished Secretary of the Navy, who is shortly to retire from office after the performance of a period of distinguished, able, and patriotic service. Therefore, in behalf of the city of Louisville and in behalf of the men, women, and children of Louisville and the Louisville region, I take advantage of this opportunity to indicate, in this public manner, to Secretary Wilbur the assurances of their deepest appreciation and gratitude because of his action in conferring upon their city and upon them this great honor. Also I join them in giving expression to the belief that no worthier name for this gallant ship of the line could have been found than that which has been given it; and the prophecy is now indulged that, manned by American sailors, carrying the flag of our country, and bearing the name *Louisville*, this magnificent cruiser in the years to come after it shall be completed and

committed unto the sea, will fully sustain the noblest traditions of the American Navy, and will bring to the city for which it is named the greatest possible measure of honor and renown.

THE PROBLEM OF PERMANENCY

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of our American institutions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, my theme is large. In fact, it is so great that I feel my utter inadequacy to present it. I can hope to give you but a fleeting glimpse of its vast circle. It is drawn from the depths of antiquity, it stretches into the unknown future, and yet it is of vital present interest to every American. It is the problem of the permanency of our national life and civilization.

From the far reaches of history I desire to draw, if possible, a few truths that, coupled with present science and philosophy, may well concern us in contemplating our present and future national life, and which are applicable to our individual lives.

No reader of history has failed to be profoundly impressed with the number of great nations, peoples, and civilizations which have appeared and disappeared—risen to supreme power and fallen into oblivion. Babylon, Assyria, Egypt, Greece, Rome, these and many more, forming a procession of colossals, have moved majestically from out the darkness of ignorance and barbarism into the light of civilization, power, preeminence, and then have passed tragically off the theater of the world's activities. To-day, we excavate their cities from the shifting sands of the deserts, or new cities have reared their growth over the old, or the old still exists, but in a living death, devoid of spirit or power or hope.

We ask, Why? Is there no such thing as permanency? Does the law of nature which demands motion, require inevitable endings, constant beginnings? Can there be no great world growth of humanity in the large continuing sense, except through new and successive peoples and waves or epochs? Must there always be displacement and replacement? In human history this law has been invariable. Every civilization in the past, with the exception of those nations or cities whose extinction may have been due to great climatic or seismic changes, has seen its period of overbalance, ultrarefinement, wealth and commercial greed, luxury, weakness, and decay; then, subjugation or supersession by a fresh race, physically strong, with a will to conquer.

These are underlying laws and principles that we must consider if we go to the bottom of the question. I may now say some startling things, but I ask that you suspend judgment until the entire theme is presented. In the human physical organization there are in the blood two kinds of corpuscles, the red and the white; the red, representing the iron, the strength-giving element; the white, the refining element. The savage represents the abnormal preponderance of the red; the highly cultured, the preponderance of the white; the one is uncivilized, the other overrefined.

ANTERIOR AND POSTERIOR BRAIN

In the first you will find excessive posterior development of the head or brain; in the second you will find an excessive frontal development. The frontal is the guiding influence, presiding over the mental attributes; the posterior is the motive power, presiding over the physical. Note that development runs from the posterior head to the frontal; that means the ascendancy of the intellectual in the individual, in peoples the advancement of civilization; in both, culture, education, gentleness, wealth. So far, so good. Then we come to the excess of these things—excess at the cost of their complements—their complements, the balance of qualities.

Carried to excess, meaning great disproportion, we find that culture results in insincerity and insincerity in falseness; education in the impractical, the impractical in the visionary; gentleness in effeminacy, and effeminacy in weakness; wealth is followed by idleness, and idleness by corruption. The end of all these is failure and death.

In the posterior brain development we find in the first alignment strength, courage, humanness (meaning social instinct, impulsiveness, passion, emotion), freedom—all beneficial and necessary, but which, carried to excess to the exclusion of their balancing qualities, their complements, develop as follows: Strength to brutality, to violence; courage to recklessness, to bravado; humanness to dissipation, to degradation; freedom to lawlessness, to savagery. And the end of all these is failure and death.

INDIVIDUAL EXAMPLES OF EXTREMES

Thus it is apparent that extremes kill. Let us take two individual examples. Here is a man who is an example of the utmost extremes of culture, gentleness, education, and wealth. His stock has run its course through seven or eight generations of wealth and idleness and is dying of decay. Vice finds him an easy prey; he has no powers of resistance, no constitution to withstand, no will; his moral, mental, and physical fibers are loosed. There is little hope for him; his inevitable end, in the natural course, is decadence and—death. It is not entirely his fault. The generations that have gone before him are in a great measure responsible; though to every man is given conscience, the divine spark, and if he wills he may save himself against all odds. But the process has gone far, accelerated by his own deliberate acts. He will perish.

On the other hand, here is a man whose blood is red. Heredity gave him that. Contact with nature has accentuated it. He comes from a fresh, virile, strong stock. His frontal development has been deficient; his posterior brain qualities are abnormally intense. He has the good qualities that belong to this type—strength, courage, humanness, love of freedom—but these have gone to their natural excess in him for lack of influence of the white corpuscle, the anterior brain qualities; and he has therefore been violent, brutal, lawless, savage. He is therefore subject to the penalty of these extremes, which is destruction. His career, carried out to its unhindered, logical conclusion, would end in a violent death.

But he is not necessarily doomed, as is the case with our other example, his antithesis, for the reason that in him there is the raw force that survives; and capacity for development, the beginnings of the frontal qualities, white corpuscles, which, though they have been undeveloped, nevertheless are there, and may at any time begin to assert themselves. If education, refinement, culture, moral principles, ambition for higher and finer things be developed in him, if those qualities are not substituted for but added to his superabundant physical power, his wonderful vitality, his fighting spirit, his love of freedom, his daring optimism, then, indeed, will there be a man to whom all things are possible. And if he then retains, as his education and refinement continue, the qualities of strength and courage, humanness, and independence, he may rise in stable equilibrium to incalculable heights.

SAME LAW AS TO NATIONS

I have spoken of individuals. It is through the individuals multiplied that these things work out in the larger organizations. All that I have said is therefore applicable to races, peoples, governments, civilizations. The nations of the past lost their vitality! Hence the tragic procession of the great peoples of antiquity; hence Egyptian civilization went down; effeminate Greek was conquered by the hardy Roman, and, in turn, the corrupt Roman by the fresh hordes of the Goths and Huns and Vandals under Attila the Scourge. I include in this list all nations which have sunk far from former grandeur. Spain was once mistress of the world. China endures because it has not lived. Such nations exist but do not live. But China, Japan, Russia, are from barbarian stocks which are yet to live, and this brings us directly to the question.

THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

What of the American people? What of the destiny of this Republic? Shall it be thus with us? Will history repeat itself? Will progress demand in time our displacement? Will we be subject to that invariable process, or will we be an exception to the hitherto insatiable law of racial and national rise, deterioration, and death? Shall we perish at the hands of a raw race which will destroy or overrun or absorb, and itself begin a new era of development to a higher civilization? Or will this process of the ages terminate with and for us?

THE EAST

Tendencies that lead to deterioration can be observed in this country to-day. The East, especially as its life is found in our great cities, represents the white corpuscle, the frontal development. There we find education, culture, refinement, industry, high civilization, wealth; there, too, we find the settled, centralizing, conservative, consolidating influences. Like the sun, the East draws everything to itself—it has the habit of increase, increment. Customs, manners, habits, views there converge, contract, set, crystallize. We can already note there exclusion, seclusion, attenuation, overbreeding, interbreeding, the gradual diminution of physical power and motive force. Excessive and long-continued wealth, handed down from generation to generation in one family or relationship, is beginning to show its effects. The process of dissipation and idleness shows on the surface in moral disintegration, broken domestic relations, subnormal birth rate, dishonest business practices, domination of

wealth, vice. Unhindered, carried to its natural end, all these mean ultimate destruction.

THE WEST

The West of this country has represented and now largely represents the red corpuscle, the posterior brain development and its particular attributes. The accompanying tendencies have in the past rather been in the ascendancy, and whereas we have seen and admired the characteristics of strength, courage, humanness, freedom, we know they have many times run to excess and become, in their intermediate form, brutality, recklessness, dissipation, lawlessness, and in their last stages, violence, bravado, degradation, savagery. All of which, unhindered by the influence of the white corpuscle, the anterior balance, spell ultimate destruction.

In the natural course of events, the East would die of disease, which is general and complete—annihilative decadence. The West, if left to its tendencies alone, would be swept by violence, which is individual—destructive savagery. The West would not die; its more forceful element would endure and supersede.

POSTERIOR HEAD QUALITIES SURVIVE

Then, of the two excesses or extremes, the posterior brain force, the red corpuscle, the element of the stronger stock, will survive. The simple reason is that there is no hope where there is decay; dissolution has set in. It is the end—the stock has lived its life. The violence of the other extreme is significant of force, power, life, growth. It is the beginning—the stock has yet to run its course.

REASONS FOR PERPETUITY OF AMERICA

Now, it is indeed a bold man who would deliberately say that with our own people and Nation the inexorable processes of the ages will be turned aside. But I believe that there are reasons which justify us in entertaining the hope that our Nation, our civilization, Americanism, will endure indefinitely.

I preface my reasons with the obvious proposition, that it being the extremes that kill, the solution of the problem of permanency of continuous efficient life, is the normal, the golden mean.

ILLUSTRATIONS

This is true in everything. All work deadens; all idleness atrophies. Neither the Arctic Zone nor the Torrid Zone produces as does the Temperate Zone. Neither mountain peaks nor the swampy low lands, but the great intermediate plains and valleys feed the world. All study without experiment, or all experiment without study, all theory or all practice do not produce the desired results. An architect's dream is of no value unless reduced to blue print and produced in wood or stone or steel; on the other hand, we do not build a house without plans. Ultraconservatism kills by inaction, ultraradicalism by overaction; progress lies between. Nonresistance and nonpreparedness insure dishonor and defeat; ultramilitarism seeks aggression and will not be borne by a free people; honor and safety lie between. Science tells us that we are all either abnormal or subnormal in some respect in some degree. The normal is the perfect type. The true course then is that of balance, harmony, a proper combination.

PROPER COMBINATION

The first series of qualities of both the frontal and posterior head development are all good and all necessary to civilization and progress. The problem is not, then, how to retard or shackle either, but how, along with the growth of each, to keep them properly proportioned. So that as long as each of these tendencies has its proper place and influence in our country's people, they will each prevent the other from going to the extreme characteristic of each; thus the balance may be maintained permanently; and, though each develop indefinitely, the second and third harmful stages may be avoided. Note, if you mingle properly or combine reasonably education and freedom, you need not fear that they will ever become the impractical and visionary on the one hand or lawlessness or savagery on the other. Likewise, combine in the same race culture and courage; then insincerity and falseness, recklessness and bravado are eliminated. Again, join gentleness and humanness and you eradicate effeminacy and weakness, dissipation and degradation. Given a people who have both wealth and strength, and you will have no idleness and corruption, brutality and violence. The rule is that these qualities act as a check upon each other and prevent the extremes.

So the question is, Shall we be able in this country to maintain the right development of the frontal and posterior brain, the guiding and the propelling forces, the conservative and the radical, the white corpuscle and the red, avoid the extremes, maintain the mean, and thus endure? There are reasons to encourage a belief that we will.

FRESH STOCK

We are as a people a fresh, practically a new, stock. The hardy, the vigorous, the daring, the bold, the courageous, the strong, joined together in our Revolution to establish the new nation. They were explorers, builders, fighters, men of red blood, freedom lovers; they excelled in the harder virtues; their posterior brain development, presiding over the physical, was strong, dominant. So, as a fresh stock, we have our national life yet to live.

VITAL FORCES MAINTAINED BY OCCUPATION OF NEW TERRITORY

We find an added argument for our perpetuity in that all through our national life, so far, the greater proportion of our people have been engaged in toil in the soil, in the subduing of the wilderness. They are yet exploring, prospecting, discovering, fighting, settling, conquering. This not only requires the motive power of the dominant physical and its attendant qualities of daring, enterprise, initiative, bravery, skill, self-dependence, but it also maintains and develops these qualities and renews in the blood of our people from the East to the West, as they settle each area, the iron of health, endurance, and longevity. Thus the blood will be kept red and strong.

INFUSION OF NEW BLOOD

Though our main racial current is the dominant Anglo-Saxon, and we will have to that extent the benefits which inhere in a distinctive blood strain, we are not a single race or nationality. Men of all nations, lands, and peoples fought in our ranks, battled nature, and laid the foundation for a new country. We are a mixture of nationalities, an admixture of blood. Not only did we have this mingling of nationalities originally, thus giving us a broad foundation and obviating, or, at least, indefinitely removing, the danger of the attenuation and weakening to which a distinct and separate strain is subject, but by the vastness and fertility of our country and the desirableness of our citizenship, this infusion of the fresh blood from the common, hardy, healthy stock of all nations, eliminating the diseased and criminal, is continuing and will continue for many years. So that, tower as high as the tree of national life may, it will be supported by adequate root and soil, for there will be this constant refreshment and reinvigoration from the bottom.

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

Once more, the physical geography of our country will have its effect in maintaining in our people a proper balance. That climate and soil and altitude have a decided influence upon the character of mankind is a well-settled truth. By the vastness of our country we are afforded a variety of topography that is highly beneficial.

Generally speaking, the East is the ocean, seaboard, seafaring commercial portion of this country, and its people naturally develop, through social and business intercourse, industry, and invention; and, through the intercourse of peoples and trades, wealth, and culture. In the central part, we have the Great Plains section where agriculture is predominant, where there is contact with the soil. Its peoples are developed most in healthful labor and strength. In the West, we have the mountainous regions. Mountain dwellers have always, and history affords abundant proof, been devotees of freedom, patriotic, unconquerable. "Montani semper liberi"—Mountaineers are always free men." Because of them, the spirit of liberty will never die with us.

With this variety of configuration and employment, the three qualities of culture, strength, and liberty will be maintained; and as long as they exist, the Nation can not die. These physical features of our country are unchangeable, hence their influence will be perpetual.

CHARACTERISTICS IMPARTED TO EACH SECTION

Not only will these respective saving qualities continue to generate and emanate and be wrought into the characters of the respective peoples of those sections, but the sections and peoples thereof being contiguous and being interlaced, despite our great area, by a thousand ties—by rail, mail, family, travel, contact, trade, interdependence—the preserving qualities of each are disseminated and absorbed throughout the whole. The leaven of each section will spread through and elevate the mass.

THE TRUE TYPE

Most marked example of this fact to-day is our central, plains people, extending from the Rockies to the Alleghenies. From each side, they absorb the best—culture from the East, freedom from the West, which, combined with their own quality of strength, makes them the most perfectly and harmoniously developed of our people. They represent the golden mean. To-day, they are the heart, the core, of this Republic. To-day, they constitute the highest average of intelligence, character, and efficiency, the best combination of all qualities, to be found

not only in the people of this Nation but they are the highest product of mankind in mass the world has produced.

BALANCED GOVERNMENT

We have a form of government that coincides and harmonizes with this theory of proper balance. Our Constitution itself is a solution of this very same problem in governmental affairs. After chiefs came monarchs, despots, royal lines, and the so-called divine right of kings. Then the people awoke to the fact that government was too much centralized in these heads and that their former individualism has left them, their liberties were gone. Denied liberty, they in time revolted against all authority and produced anarchy; and history ever since has been made up of the struggles between governing powers for more power and the people for more freedom. Out of all this it was seen that there must be both governing power, meaning law and central authority, and individual liberty.

When this Nation was established it came nearer solving the problem of the proper balance of these factors than had any nation on earth. In fact, it solved it, although readjustments will go on for many years to come. We are now in a period of regulating too unrestricted liberty, to which we swung in our revolution in our fierce reaction against a tyrannical monarchy. Our Government is so formed that there is authority—the centralizing, centripetal power, corresponding to the sun in the solar system, the white corpuscle in the human system; and there is liberty—the expanding, centrifugal power, corresponding to the force of the earth's tangent-seeking momentum in the planetary system, the red corpuscle in the human system. Thus, like the earth, the Government is kept in its proper orbit equally balanced between centralization and individualism. The result is orderly liberty, which should endure.

PATRIOTIC SOLIDARITY

Another point of view. The patriotic solidarity of our people, considering our mass, notwithstanding the influx of heterogeneous millions, is the most wonderful of all time. The homogeneous patriotism of our people is not a subject but an appreciating, participating citizen patriotism. It is not the forced support of a system or a name, it is not an ignorant, blind, mechanical attachment, but a broad, free, intelligent, voluntary, glorious patriotism. This is due largely to our form of government, each individual being a unit in the sum of the whole.

EXCEPTION TO ALL NATIONS

We stand to-day an exception to all nations of earth, past and present, in that, while every nation may have some of the qualities that make for continuity and some nations have many of the characteristics and reasons for longevity, no nation, save America, has all of these factors that go to insure perpetuity.

THE WORLD PREPARED FOR PERMANENT PROGRESS

Why should the present civilization, as founded and as it is progressing, ever be displaced and replaced? There is no answer which appeals to reason. I hold the abiding conviction that the world is prepared for the development of a permanent, constantly progressing civilization. Why is not this, our Nation, our people, the fitting foundation for the perfect superstructure; the prepared root and stock for the perfect growth, foliage, flower, and fruit? For thousands of years mankind has been struggling upward for freedom, for justice, for liberty, for knowledge, for brotherhood. Through our race, upon our soil, under our Government may the goal of the ages be attained, and may we uplift and draw all mankind with us.

OUR DUTY

But a nation so situated and provided is like a man with talents. Talents alone do not prevail. A nation may preserve itself in efficiency, or it may fail despite all advantages. With all that has been given us it would be the calamity of all the world calamities—a crime against humanity—were Americans to fail of their high destiny.

We must remember as a people and as individuals that faith in our destiny is not enough. "Faith without works is dead." We must remember that the problem of permanency is solved by harmonious development, by equilibrium.

We are not as a people overrefined—far from it; we can not overemphasize education; education must go on and on; it is absolutely essential to our great future. We can and do underemphasize vitality. Vitality is necessary for existence, for life; and life is the *sine qua non*—the without which not. We must remember that highly-tempered steel crystallizes, brittles, and snaps under impact and strain, unless the strength, the molecular cohesion, the inherent tenacity of the original iron is retained.

We must bear in mind that a nation steeped in commercialism, the pursuit of material wealth, if it be to the exclusion of high ideals—in action, of strength exercised, of right defended—is treading the way of one extreme which kills, courting the loss

of the spirit that battles for and preserves existence. We do not expect to be attacked. Nobody wants war. But war is a possibility. We must be able, ready, and willing to defend our life or join in the procession of the living dead.

The Greeks fell not because they became highly intellectual, beauty lovers, artists, but because they lost their stamina, their motive power, the will to live.

The Romans fell not because of the intellectual development that produced the Roman law, not because of education, oratory, literature, and wealth, but because of the idleness, weakness, vice, corruption, which became associated with these things and the loss of honor, courage, vital force, the will to live.

Attila was called "the scourge" not without reason. "The scourge," because he was the instrument for the overrunning of a nation because of her delinquency, her failure to retain vitality, which abides only with morality, cleanness, health, activity, and redness of blood.

May America never cease refining. May America never be scourged. She is now full upon the stage of the world. Will she remain there? It is for us to decide for this and several generations whether she will lose her harmony of development, her self-preserving elements, and be forced off the stage of humanity's progress, either by a raw race or by a civilized power with a will to conquer; or whether she will hold fast to her vital forces, retain the iron in her blood, her moral and physical courage, her fighting spirit, the will to live. And stand. Maintain her balance and rise in humanity's service, to heights of glory.

Right alone does not save when pitted against might, but right evolving might will triumph over wrong and might. We must be a civilized, refined Nation whose will will be developed instead of atrophied, whose vitality, dynamic powers, and efficiency will be conserved and intensified simultaneously with advancement in culture and wealth.

Thus only may we endure, and our liberty, our ideals, Americanism be secured to humanity. Thus we will go upward, with mankind, to an ever-increasing, ennobling, and beneficent destiny.

STEAMSHIP "W. I. RADCLIFFE"

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 11698, conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the owner of the steamship *W. I. Radcliffe* against the United States, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 11698, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

MINUTE MEN'S CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD remarks of my own on a constitutional amendment for which I have introduced a bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a constitutional amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I give this brief statement as to a resolution which I have introduced at the request of Frank J. Batcheller, chairman of the national committee of the American Minute Men, providing for an amendment to the Constitution. The Minute Men's organization has now a membership of over 6,000,000, and their amendment has been indorsed by organization whose membership exceeds 15,000,000. It is likely that resolutions backed by this immense constituency will be presented to the next Congress with an appeal for the approval of their proposed constitutional amendment.

This measure would absolutely prohibit appropriations of public money for sectarian schools and other religious institutions and would terminate all controversy over the matter. In the minds of thinking men it would forever remove any real cause of religious controversy from American politics. The measure is in every way eminently just and fair. It treats every religious body exactly alike. The Government, remember, must be the protector of all churches, but it must not be the patron of any.

There is a very real need for the amendment. In several States large amounts of public money are appropriated regu-

larly for sectarian institutions. In several other States frequent attempts are made to secure such grants, many of the efforts being successful. Open demands have been made for State support of sectarian schools in different parts of the country, and actual attempts have been made to secure such appropriations in Rhode Island, Maine, and Illinois, the effort being successful in the last-named State, and hundreds of thousands of dollars being given to the religious schools of one denomination. There is no provision in the National Constitution to prevent sectarian appropriations by Congress whenever the element favoring such grants can secure the necessary votes in this body. These facts have convinced thinking citizens that this great issue must be met by the American people, and I believe that the statesmanlike way to settle the question is by the adoption of the Minute Men amendment.

The American Minute Men, the movement which originated the amendment and which is leading the fight in its behalf, is in no way connected with any other society or organization. It aims to prohibit sectarian appropriations; that and nothing else. It is in no sense of the word narrow, bigoted, or intolerant. It stands for broad, American principles in a broad, American way.

Its present membership is at least 5,000,000, and that membership is composed of men and women of the highest possible standing.

This amendment, which has been indorsed by civic, religious, and patriotic organizations all over America, is necessary to correct widespread abuses as natural as human nature itself. Of course, no man can object to such a law, except somebody who wants to get his hand in the Public Treasury for his own particular creed. Such an amendment is as fundamental as the very spirit of our Constitution—a spirit, alas, which has often been abused for lack of this specific provision.

If Roger Williams was right in teaching that the State has no right to coerce any person's conscience in the realm of religion, then this constitutional amendment is right in demanding that no man's purse shall be coerced for the sake of promoting another person's sectarian views. Its enactment into law will be the tardy triumph of the very essence of real Americanism.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 5544, to increase the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and I am doing this by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 5544, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is hereby increased from 12 members to 15 members: *Provided,* That the 3 additional members to be appointed by the President shall be acquainted with the needs of aeronautical science, either civil or military, or skilled in aeronautical engineering or its allied sciences, and shall serve as such without compensation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PENSIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 16878) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, for printing under the rule.

JOINT-STOCK LAND BANKS

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate bill 4039, to exempt joint-stock land banks from the provisions of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended. This bill having been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency I ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4039, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill the gentleman sought to bring up last night?

Mr. McFADDEN. It is; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of the second paragraph of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C. title 15, ch. 1, sec. 19), is amended to read as follows:

"Provided, That nothing in this section shall apply to mutual savings banks not having a capital stock represented by shares, to joint-stock land banks organized under the provisions of the Federal farm loan act, or to other banking institutions which do no commercial banking business."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McFADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] for 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced in the House a measure known as House Resolution No. 341, providing for the appointment of a committee of the House of Representatives for the purpose of investigating and making report on the illegal entrance of aliens into the United States of America, and fixing the responsibility for same.

I desire at this time to send the resolution to the reading clerk and have it read out of my time:

Resolution

Whereas it is estimated by reliable authority that approximately 1,000,000 aliens are now residing in the United States of America who entered our country illegally; and

Whereas it is known that hundreds of thousands of undesirable aliens have been smuggled, or otherwise illegally permitted to enter the United States of America in defiance of law, within the past eight years; and

Whereas such aliens illegally entered into the United States of America have added to the problems of the unemployed, they having displaced American citizens; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that the hordes of undesirable aliens who have been illegally and fraudulently permitted to enter our borders in recent years have added materially to the wave of crime and increased law violations in America; and

Whereas it is further known that a large percentage of such aliens as have been brought into America illegally within the past few years are engaged in the traffic of narcotics and liquors and are smuggling and bootlegging these unlawful and deadly drugs and liquors to the youth of our land, thereby undermining health, integrity, and moral fiber of the forthcoming generations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of this House is hereby authorized and directed to appoint nine Members from the House to act as and to constitute a special investigating committee; that said committee is hereby authorized and directed to immediately institute a thorough investigation to ascertain the facts and conditions concerning the foregoing allegations made, to determine the number of such aliens who have illegally entered the United States within the past eight years, the reasons for their illegal entrance and continued residence herein, and to ascertain the agency or agencies responsible for such conditions; and the aforesaid special committee shall report its findings to the House of Representatives on or before the first Monday in December, 1929, with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purpose of such investigation this special committee shall have, and is hereby given, the power to meet at such time and places, and to employ such stenographic service to report its hearings, and to make any and all other expenditures, including expenses for traveling, as it may deem necessary. The said special committee is further authorized to sit immediately following the adjournment of the Seventieth Congress, to send for persons and papers, and to provide for all expenses incident thereto, to administer oaths and affirmations, and to take testimony. The chairman of this special committee, designated as such by the Speaker, is hereby authorized and directed to issue subpoenas. In the event this committee holds hearings beyond the bounds and confines of the District of Columbia, the United States marshal of the particular district where such hearings are being held is hereby authorized and directed to serve any and all subpoenas required of him by the said special committee. Any person who willfully refuses to obey any such subpoena and any witness guilty of contumacy shall be liable to the penalty provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes.

The Department of Labor, and any and all other departments of the Government, shall cooperate with said committee and, upon request, shall furnish such assistance and information to said committee as will enable it to make a full, complete, and comprehensive report and findings.

All expenses of this special committee incurred under this resolution in making a full, fair, and thorough investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In introducing this resolution in the House of Representatives seeking to have a committee appointed by the House for the purpose of investigating the illegal entry of aliens into the United States, I had only one object in view, and that was to protect this country from a general influx of undesirable aliens in excess of the quotas provided by law.

Certainly no one can question the seriousness of this situation when the daily press is constantly carrying news items to the effect that smuggling and bootlegging are carried on promiscuously throughout the country. Neither can anyone seriously question the fact that there are hundreds of thousands, yes, there have been, in my judgment, according to the best information I can get, more than 1,000,000 aliens admitted illegally and improperly to the United States during the last eight years.

It is not the purpose of the resolution to embarrass anyone in authority, but most certainly the people of the United States are entitled to have their laws administered in a proper manner and to see to it that the officers in charge of law enforcement do their duty as outlined by the Congress of the United States. To hold any other view is contrary to the spirit and intent of our laws and is a rank miscarriage of justice. I have no particular interest in who administers the law, provided the law is properly administered, but as an American citizen and a Representative in Congress I say to you no excuse can be given by any law-enforcement officer for permitting the illegal admission of undesirable aliens into this country.

In my judgment no greater crime can be permitted to exist in America than the promiscuous bootlegging of aliens into the United States. Especially is this true when it is considered from the standpoint of law enforcement. Congress recently voted increased millions in an effort to better enforce prohibition in America, and yesterday the House passed the Jones bill, providing drastic penalties for violations of the dry law. I voted for the bill, hoping it will aid law enforcement. But I submit for your consideration that it will continue to be difficult to have real effective prohibition enforcement when officers and those sworn to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States permit the illegal entry of more than a million aliens into our borders, many of whom are the scum of the Old World, who have no respect for our laws and who are adding materially to that great army of bootleggers. Many of these undesirable aliens are not only peddling booze but are bootlegging drugs and narcotics and contributing materially to the breaking down of law and order and lax enforcement in many quarters.

Before introducing my resolution to make a thorough investigation as to the number of aliens who have entered the United States I made a rather extensive investigation of the situation. If given an opportunity, I know that I can produce witnesses who will give the Congress information that is really astounding. I think it will be clearly demonstrated by investigation by a proper committee of Congress that not only are aliens bootlegged into the United States in large numbers and pay taken from them for their entry but in a great many instances the people who bootleg them into the country assist in having them deported after they have taken their money from them.

Furthermore, gentlemen of the Congress, I am convinced that undeniable and indisputable evidence can be obtained where aliens have been brought in and paid the price of entry to immigration officers, then robbed of all the remaining money they had in their possession, beaten up, and deported shortly thereafter. I am assured that it can be demonstrated by an investigation that women have been brought into this country, the price paid for their entry in accordance with the custom of those who have been taking bribes for their illegal entry into the United States, that these women have given birth to children shortly after their entry and left stranded, with no money and without proper medical attention.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman state where he gets his information?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am glad the gentleman from Illinois has asked the question, and I assure my distinguished

and able friend that I did not make these statements without a thorough investigation, as I stated at the outset. I hold in my hand letters and affidavits from former immigration officials, and I will say to the gentleman I shall be glad to let him see some of them, and will also be delighted to submit same to a proper committee of the Congress. I think I can open the eyes of the gentleman with reference to this deplorable situation.

Mr. SABATH. I will say in reply that the committee, as well as myself, will be delighted and pleased to obtain this information and such evidence, because I know the committee is desirous of putting an end to the practice that it is charged is going on along the borders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman, and I again assure him that I will be glad to give him this information and much additional information if he so desires.

I have been assured by men who are willing to testify that they can tell a congressional committee, if they are properly protected, of various cases wherein aliens have been bootlegged into the country, where bribes have been accepted, and where reports have been made to the authorities and no action taken. As an instance of this deplorable, damnable condition, I have a case in mind—and I think the accuracy of the statement can be established without any question of doubt—where immigration inspectors have watched the smuggling of aliens, liquor, and morphine into the country in wholesale lots, and where the authorities were notified by immigration inspectors who could not be bribed that on certain dates smuggling boats would arrive at certain points, and instead of the authorities taking proper precaution to prevent the illegal entry of these aliens into the country, as well as the liquor and dope, they were permitted to land unmolested, unload their cargo of aliens, liquor, and narcotics, despite the fact that those in authority had advance information that these boats would enter.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield again to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. This is a very serious charge against the Department of Labor and the immigration inspectors and officials, and in view of the fact that the gentleman states that he has the evidence, I think he ought to put it in the RECORD. We ought to know about it. We are entitled to have the information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be glad to give the gentleman and the committee and the House information concerning this and many other matters if they will permit me to appear before a proper committee. I could bring witnesses here within one hour. I have talked with them and I have some of their affidavits. All I am asking now is a chance to be heard and call witnesses before an investigating committee.

Mr. SABATH. Whenever the gentleman is ready, I will assure him that we will endeavor to call a meeting of the committee and give him the opportunity he seeks, and I am only regretful he has not made the request before to-day.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be glad to yield, provided I may be assured of a little more time. I only have 20 minutes, and I want to give the Congress what information I can in the limited time given me. I have considerable information that is more astounding than any I have yet given you.

Mr. GIFFORD. I simply want to ask the gentleman if he has referred this information to the proper executive departments previous to bringing it here seeking an investigation, and also ask him if that is not the proper place for such information to go in the first instance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that I did not secure all the information I have in my possession until yesterday, but I think it is proper to call the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that I have introduced this resolution and have asked to appear before a proper committee and produce my witnesses. Gentlemen, I have them in abundance. Moreover, I am very much of the opinion that the proper departments have in their possession much of the evidence given me. Just why no action has been taken I am at a loss to understand.

I am also advised on what I have reason to consider reliable authority that as many as 150 aliens, to say nothing of the liquor and narcotics, have been landed within a very few days at one given point.

I have no doubt that substantially these further facts can be demonstrated, that when new immigration officers are assigned to certain points they will be immediately approached with the advice that they can have a high-powered car and go on the pay roll for much more money per week than they receive from the Government if they will only "keep their mouths shut" or be away from the docks at certain times when the boats arrive.

If these men do not see fit to accept the terms of the alien bootleggers and have a sense of justice and decency and proper respect for their oaths of office, I am told they are either removed or some kind of complaint is filed against them. If they, in turn, seek to report these infamous, scandalous, and outrageous cases of violation of the law to a higher authority, they are dismissed from the service, so my informants declare, or threatened to be beaten up, if not actually beaten for doing so. If given an opportunity I can produce before an investigating committee men who will not only testify that they have been threatened to be beaten up for making reports of illegal entry of aliens into the country, but I am sure we can produce witnesses who were assigned to beat them up if they did not accept the terms.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly I will yield to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. I would like to ask the gentleman in that connection why a resort to the courts has not been had if such a condition prevails. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted that the gentleman has asked the question. I was just coming to that very thought. I will say to the gentleman that I yield to no one in my respect for the courts, but it is very difficult for an honest immigration official to get a square deal when he is "framed" by these law violators, these gangs of criminals who have no regard for law, for their oaths, and who delight in railroading honest officials to the penitentiary.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman has the information, I would appreciate it if he will put in the RECORD the number of such inspectors that have been discharged because they have failed to cooperate with the bootleggers, or any additional evidence he may have; and let me suggest to the gentleman that I know something about this information that comes to Members a few days before an immigration bill is taken up on the floor of the House, and I want to say that you can not always rely on all the "dope" they send out, because most of the time such people can not prove their statements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am pleased to assure the gentleman that I have asked my informants to reduce their statements to writing and, if possible, to affidavits. I have some of their affidavits and signed statements. I have promises of others that they will be delighted to give, if properly protected, before a proper committee—information that will astound the gentleman and shock the entire country. [Applause.]

Let us suppose a case, and I have reasons to believe that if this committee is appointed and makes proper investigations that it can uncover just such cases: Inspector A is an honest man, and he catches 5, 10, or even 15 aliens who have illegally entered the country and who have paid the price, whatever it may be—perhaps from \$200 to \$1,000 per alien—and the aliens are taken into court. Inspector A brings charges against them for illegal entry and incidentally in these charges says Inspector B permitted the illegal entry into the country. The aliens in all probability will be instructed to plead guilty of having come into the country, and have as their defense that they paid the price required of them to be admitted; and when the court asks them to whom they paid the bootleg money, they are instructed to say they paid it to Inspector A, who made the arrest, and identify Inspector A as the man to whom they paid the graft.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaGUARDIA). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a very informative address, in which we are all interested, and I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for a period of 10 minutes.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have a lot of matters to take up to-day. Would the gentleman just as soon extend the rest of his remarks?

Mr. GARBER. The gentleman seldom addresses the House and certainly does not abuse the privilege of the House, and I would consider it a personal favor if the gentleman from New York would permit this extension of time.

Mr. SNELL. We have to adjourn at 4.30 for the Democratic caucus. I do not want to cut the gentleman off, but I hope he will not go longer than the 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I promise the gentleman I will not continue longer than 10 additional minutes, and I would not ask for any extension of time if I had not been interrupted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. GARBER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let us see. I believe I was discussing a case I have in mind of Inspectors A and B. May I

not inquire in what kind of a position would Inspector A, the honest, faithful officer, find himself, under circumstances I related before being interrupted. Of course, the aliens would be deported, because they have plead guilty, but what about honest Inspector A who caught the aliens? Where do you suppose he would land as a result of his experience in the United States court? Or let us suppose that the aliens who have been caught, after they have paid the price, do not identify the inspector who made the arrest as the one who received the graft, but instead identify some prominent citizen, who may be in the court, or suppose some citizen who has interested himself in trying to break up an alien bootleg ring? These aliens will in all probability be instructed to name him as the one to whom they paid the graft and the court sends for this citizen and brings him before the judge, when these aliens positively identify this man as the one who accepted the bribe for their illegal entry. What happens to this public-spirited citizen in cases of this kind? I am quite sure that it would be a good guess to predict that he would take a trip to Atlanta or elsewhere for a forced vacation. I have heard of just such a case and perhaps if the committee is appointed we can produce some citizens who have served terms in Atlanta for just such cases as this.

Let us take another case. Suppose this committee in making its investigation as proposed in my resolution should find that men are willing to testify to the fact that they were the parties acting as immigration officers who were instructed by higher officers to act as a clearing house and accept for the ring the money paid by the aliens for illegal entry into the country? Could anyone say that if such evidence of flagrant violation of the law were disclosed as a result of this investigation that the efforts of Congress in making the investigation would be useless?

If by chance we were able to uncover, in our efforts to give clean government, the fact that when reports are made by officers who had some regard for their oath of office and some regard for common decency and the best interests of our common country, when they fail to get proper cooperation from district inspectors or other higher authorities, to the authorities in Washington, these reports instead of being investigated by the proper authority were forwarded to other district inspectors, who in turn forwarded them to the district inspector guilty of having been engaged in the business of bootlegging, and the man or men making reports of these flagrant violations of the law were told that if they made any more reports except through the regular channels they would be bumped off, beaten up, or something of that kind, would not such investigation have any effect on relieving this horrible situation?

Or let us presume a still further case. Suppose it were to develop, in an investigation, that when district inspectors or other inspectors are checked up and found remiss in their duties, or even guilty of accepting or knowing that bribes are accepted, and when such facts became known instead of being dismissed from the service they were transferred to other posts where they could ply their dastardly trade in a more remunerative manner and where opportunities for compensation were more alluring. Do you not feel, gentlemen, if this and other similar and even worse cases can be proven, that it would be worth the while to pursue an investigation of this character, in order that the Congress and the country may know just what is going on and those in higher authority may be convinced of the dire need for improvement and a general shake-up in several quarters. [Applause.]

It can not be said that I have ulterior motives in pressing a question of this kind. It is a well-known fact that many aliens have been admittedly illegally entered into the United States during the last eight years, and I assume that the new administration would surely welcome an investigation as to why these conditions exist. We are supposed to have an outstanding genius who is about to enter upon his arduous duties at the head of the Government, who, we hope and believe, will refuse to tolerate such deplorable and damnable conditions. It is not a party matter at all. It is a matter worthy the consideration of our people, as well as that of the Congress of the United States. I, therefore, express the hope that a thorough investigation of these conditions may be had at an early date, and see what can be done to rid the country of one of the blackest crimes in the annals of our Government. [Applause.]

HOSPITALIZATION FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order the Chair recognizes the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have asked for time to-day in order that I might discuss H. R. 15921, a bill which I reported to the House for the Committee

on World War Veterans' Legislation last week. This bill authorizes additional hospital, domiciliary, and out-patient facilities for our World War veterans. I wish to tell Members of the House of the greatly overcrowded conditions, not only in our veterans' hospitals but also in the State hospitals. That there is need for beds for the tuberculosis and neuropsychiatric cases in both Federal and State hospitals there is no denying. The situation is most deplorable. The Veterans' Bureau has repeatedly said that there are no unoccupied veterans' hospital beds for neuropsychiatric cases anywhere in the country.

There is also need for tuberculosis beds in certain sections of the country, and there is need for medical and surgical beds in certain sections of the country.

According to the records of the United States Veterans' Bureau on January 31, 1929, the bureau was operating 48 hospitals, using a part of the facilities of 50 other Government hospitals, and 144 civilian hospitals. The patient load in these hospitals was as follows:

TUBERCULOSIS	
United States veterans' hospitals.....	5,380
Public Health Service hospitals.....	24
Army hospitals.....	706
Navy hospitals.....	87
Soldiers' homes.....	564
Contract hospitals.....	447
Total, tuberculosis patients.....	7,208

GENERAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL	
United States veterans' hospitals.....	3,668
Public Health Service hospitals.....	386
Army hospitals.....	1,135
Navy hospitals.....	2,141
Soldiers' homes.....	400
Contract hospitals.....	211
Total, general medical and surgical cases.....	7,941

NEUROPSYCHIATRIC	
United States veterans' hospitals.....	10,945
Army hospitals.....	189
Navy hospitals.....	316
Soldiers' homes.....	662
St. Elizabeths.....	347
Contract hospitals.....	1,160
Total, neuropsychiatric patients.....	13,619

SUMMARY	
The grand total for the above three classes of patients is:	
United States veterans' hospitals.....	19,993
Public Health Service hospitals.....	410
Army hospitals.....	2,030
Navy hospitals.....	2,544
Soldiers' homes.....	1,626
St. Elizabeths.....	347
Contract hospitals.....	1,818
Making a total patient load of.....	28,768

These figures, as before stated, show the patient load of the United States Veterans' Bureau as of January 31, 1929. As of this same date the total capacity of the United States veterans' hospitals was 21,805, with additional facilities in process of building of 1,007. The average number of beds occupied during the month of January, 1929, was 19,601.

The hospital-construction program submitted by the United States Veterans' Bureau follows:

Hospital-construction program submitted by United States Veterans' Bureau

Location	Type	Beds	Cost	Purpose
Bedford, Mass.....	Neuropsychiatric	150	\$360,000	Continued-treatment building; additional staff and attendants' quarters.
New York, N. Y.....	do.....	1,000	1,900,000	Additional facilities at Northport, Long Island; and the new hospital authorized at Somerset Hills, N. J., to replace the Bronx.
New York City....	General ¹	200	1,000,000	New hospital and facilities for regional office.
Western New York State.	Neuropsychiatric	400	1,700,000	New hospital with facilities for a limited number of general cases to supplement the general beds contemplated at Aspinwall, Pa., and facilities for regional office.
Augusta, Ga.....	General.....	138	300,000	Acute building.
Alabama.....	do.....	250	1,100,000	New hospital and facilities for regional office.
Gulfport, Miss.....	Neuropsychiatric	138	340,000	Acute building; additional quarters.

¹ Facilities will be provided for all 3 types of cases with beds for general condition predominant.

Hospital-construction program submitted by United States Veterans' Bureau—Con.

Location	Type	Beds	Cost	Purpose
Indiana.....	General ¹	150	\$500,000	New hospital (exclusive of personnel quarters) and facilities for regional office.
North Chicago....	Neuropsychiatric	150	280,000	Additional beds and quarters for personnel.
Knoxville, Iowa ¹	do.....	150	270,000	Continued-treatment building.
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	General ¹	250	1,250,000	New hospital and facilities for regional office.
San Francisco, Calif.	do. ¹	200	1,000,000	New hospital with facilities for diagnostic center and regional office.
Tucson, Ariz.....	Tuberculosis.....	100	280,000	Additional beds and quarters.
Texas.....	Neuropsychiatric	300	1,200,000	New hospital and facilities for regional office.
Total.....		3,576	\$11,480,000	

¹ Facilities will be provided for all 3 types of cases with beds for general condition predominant.

² To offset the expenditures called for by the above program the bureau proposes to secure legislation authorizing the sale of the hospital properties at the Bronx, N. Y., Dwight, Ill., and Waukesha, Wis., which it is conservatively estimated will result in the return of not less than \$3,750,000 to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, Treasury Department. In addition, it is estimated that the sum of \$2,000,000 will be saved to the Federal Government through the return of the hospital property at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., to the War Department for the purpose of housing a regiment of troops. Savings of approximately \$143,000 annually will also be effected through the proposed evacuation of the space now reserved in leased buildings for the regional offices at New York, N. Y.; San Francisco, Calif.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and possibly Dallas, Tex. The regional offices at Buffalo, N. Y., and Birmingham, Ala., are occupying space in Government-owned buildings.

It will be noted that the program of the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau is largely to provide additional facilities for neuropsychiatric cases and that while four of the projects mentioned are designated as hospitals of the general type, these facilities will provide for all three types of cases with beds for general medical and surgical cases predominating. The director of the bureau when appearing before the committee stated that the bureau's experience has shown that it is desirable to provide in each general hospital a certain number of beds for neuropsychiatric cases and a certain number of beds for tubercular cases. The wards might be termed as clearing houses. It is to such hospitals that suspected neuropsychiatric or tubercular cases will be sent. Their condition will be carefully studied and, if possible, a recovery made. If, after intensive treatment, it is determined that the disease will be of long duration, or that recovery within a reasonable time may not be had, the plan is to then send the patient to an institution for the care of such cases alone.

It will be noted that tubercular facilities are provided for at Tucson, Ariz. As is well known, there is already existing a large tubercular hospital at that point and the additional beds and quarters provided for herein are absolutely necessary to take care of the present load.

It is the plan of the bureau to offset the expenditures authorized by this bill upon the completion of the program by securing legislation authorizing the sale of the hospital properties at the Bronx, N. Y., Dwight, Ill., and Waukesha, Wis., which, it is conservatively estimated by the director of the bureau, will result in the return of not less than \$3,750,000 to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, Treasury Department. In addition, it is estimated that upon the completion of the program the hospital property at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., may be returned to the War Department for the purpose of housing troops which would result in a probable saving to the Federal Government of \$2,000,000. Savings of approximately \$143,000 annually will also be effected through the proposed evacuation of the space now reserved in leased buildings for the regional offices at New York, N. Y., San Francisco, Calif., Albuquerque, N. Mex., Indianapolis, Ind., and, possibly, Dallas, Tex. The regional offices at Buffalo, N. Y., and Birmingham, Ala., are occupying space in Government-owned buildings.

The savings, in so far as the regional offices are concerned, will be immediate upon the completion of this program, as it has been recommended by the bureau, and in adopting the program your committee agrees that sufficient space in the administration buildings of such hospitals should be allotted to house the activities of the regional offices. In so far as the sale of the properties mentioned is concerned, your committee did not feel it proper to include in the present bill any authority, as experience may show upon the completion of this program, as has been the case with others, that the patient load of the Veterans' Bureau will not permit the immediate disposal of such plants.

The director of the bureau has informed the committee that, due to the fact that the bureau had not planned on presenting a program at this session of Congress and to the limited time available for the preparation of a program, it was not possible, as has been customary, for the bureau to submit its recommendations to the Federal Board of Hospitalization for the consideration of that agency. However, your committee had before it the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, the representatives of the various service organizations, many Members of both Houses of Congress, as well as others, all of whom submitted data showing the need for the projects authorized herein.

It must be kept in mind that there are at present 55,000 mentally afflicted World War veterans whose disabilities are connected with the service, and for which they are now in receipt of compensation. Yet less than one-fourth of these veterans—10,500—are now in Veterans' Bureau hospitals receiving Government care and treatment. What of the other 40,000 veterans mentally afflicted as a result of the war? Are they to be denied Government treatment and cure, because we have failed to build hospitals for their care?

The condition of many of these 40,000 veterans is growing steadily worse. Soon thousands of them will require hospitalization, and the Government should be prepared to do its duty by them by constructing hospitals for their treatment and cure when needed.

Congress, under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, in section 202-10, has made mandatory the hospitalization of all T. B. and N. P. cases.

Some Members of the House feel, I know, that the States rather than the Federal Government should pay for the care of the nonservice-connected cases. Whether that is true or not, whether they are right in their opinions or not, I think we are all agreed that either the State or the Federal Government should care for the disabled veterans that need hospitalization. The Federal Government called the men to arms; the Federal Government should hospitalize our men before it is too late.

I have an idea that it may be possible to get the States at a later date to pay or help pay for the care of our nonservice-connected cases in veterans' hospitals. In the meantime, we need beds desperately and should build Veterans' Bureau hospitals. I have not time to read the telegrams from different State hospitals and from commissioners of health of different States, proving that there is hospital overcrowding, but I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted at this time and which are as follows:

PIERRE, S. DAK., February 24, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

Insane, 1,300 beds; none vacant. Tuberculosis, 406 beds; none vacant. Feeble-minded, 526; none vacant. No State general hospital.

P. B. JENKINS.

DOVER, DEL., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

About 15 vacant beds in tuberculosis hospital; no vacant bed in insane hospital. This State maintains no general hospital beds.

A. C. JOST,

Board of Health Building.

RICHMOND, VA., February 24, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

State tuberculosis hospitals only under our jurisdiction. Approximately 600 beds in 3 sanatoria all full. Information as to vacant beds at State neuropathic hospitals must be secured from superintendents at Williamsburg, Staunton, Marion, Petersburg, and Lynchburg. State welfare commissioner stated last week that each was crowded. New buildings are nearing completion. General hospital wards at University of Virginia almost always full. General hospital wards, medical college, Richmond, have to-day 20 vacant beds; white, 25; colored, 10; under 12 at children's hospital.

ROY K. FLANNAGAN,

Assistant State Health Commissioner.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

State hospitals in Illinois are overcrowded 1,190. The above are insane patients. Our institutions are not grouped according diseases.

RODNEY H. BRAMDON,

Director Department of Public Welfare.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., February 24, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Wire received. No State hospitals in Alabama, except for mental cases. These for both white and colored are crowded to capacity.

STATE BOARD OF HEALTH.

LINCOLN, NEBR., February 24, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington:

No vacant beds in Nebraska State hospitals.

BARTHOLOMEW,

Director of Public Health.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, February 24, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Utah has no State hospital, excepting one for insane, at Provo, at present overpopulated.

P. B. BEATTY,

State Health Commissioner.

BOISE, IDAHO, February 24, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

There is no State hospital here.

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

BOSTON, MASS., February 18, 1929.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

Waiting lists at four tuberculosis sanatoria and cancer hospital under this department. Tewksbury State Infirmary reports 150 patients beyond supposed capacity. Department of mental diseases reports no vacancies in its institutions.

G. H. BIGELOW, M. C.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives:

State insane hospitals have no vacant beds except as needed for new patients as admitted. State has no psychiatric hospital. State has one general hospital at Indianapolis, with a constant waiting list. State tuberculosis hospital needs 300 more beds to care for waiting list.

WM. F. KING,

State Health Commissioner.

AUSTIN, TEX., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

All State hospitals full capacity. Have long waiting list.

J. C. ANDERSON, M. D.,

State Health Officer.

CHEYENNE, WYO., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

Ten vacant beds, tuberculosis; 50, general; none, neuropsychiatric.

AMY G. ABBOT,

Secretary State Board of Charities and Reform.

ATLANTA, GA., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

No vacant beds in tuberculosis or neuropsychiatric hospitals in State. Information as to beds in general hospitals not available.

T. F. ABERCROMBIE,

State Commissioner of Health.

SEATTLE, WASH., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

No vacant beds any State institution or hospitals. Legislature convening hope to pass building program at this session. No State tuberculosis hospital. State of Washington has adopted county-unit plan. Total number 6, all overcrowded.

A. E. STUHT, M. D.,

State Director of Health.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

Hospitals for insane are full. School for feeble-minded and epileptic approximately 15 vacancies. Sanatorium for tubercular, 20 vacancies to-day.

W. P. FULKERSON, *President.*

ALBANY, N. Y., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Overcrowding State hospitals for insane, approximately 30 per cent. Substantial construction under way.

FREDERICK W. PARSONS, M. D.,

Commissioner.

HARTFORD, CONN., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Twenty-eight vacant beds for ambulatory patients only in five State tuberculosis sanatoria. Both State insane hospitals overcrowded and construction of another considered. State has no general hospital. CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

CONCORD, N. H., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

No vacant beds in the New Hampshire State Hospital for Insane.

C. H. DOLLOFF, *Superintendent.*

TOPEKA, KANS., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

Tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric, and general hospitals, Kansas, filled beyond capacity.

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION.

TRENTON, N. J., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

New Jersey insane hospital 1,700 overcrowded.

W. J. ELLIS.

DENVER, COLO., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

No vacant beds in any Colorado State hospital. Each hospital needing additional beds.

S. R. MCKELVEY,

Secretary State Board of Health.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress:

Waiting list for tuberculosis hospital. Neuropsychiatric, Pendleton, few beds. Salem, full.

FREDERICK D. STRICKER,

State Health Officer.

RALEIGH, N. C., February 24, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Tuberculosis, none. Orthopedic, none. Neuropsychiatric, about 40. State has no general hospitals.

CHAS. O. LAUGHINGHOUSE.

AUGUSTA, ME., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Hospitals mentioned in your telegram not under supervision of State department of health. Each have separate board, but reports state all beds occupied and large waiting lists.

C. F. KENDALL.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

West Virginia has four State hospitals for neuropsychiatrics: Huntington, Weston, Spencer, and Lakin; all overcrowded. No vacant beds. Building nearing completion at Lakin, 250 beds. Budget before legislature now in session carries appropriation for 250-bed hospital building at Weston. We have one sanitarium at Hopemount for tuberculosis. No vacant beds now, but new building, 125 beds, to be opened

in September and another sanitarium at Beckley to be opened in September, 150 beds. We have three general hospitals—Welch, 54 vacant beds; McKendree, 30 vacant beds; and Fairmont, 27 vacant beds.

STATE BOARD OF CONTROL,
By J. S. LAKIN.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives:

Re telegram, no vacant beds. State hospital for nervous diseases, 2,700 inmates, normally 2,200-bed hospital. State tuberculosis sanitarium, 340 beds; long waiting list. No general or other State hospital. Government has Army hospital, Hot Springs, and Veterans' Bureau hospital, Little Rock. Information available Washington, these hospitals.
C. W. GARRISON.

JACKSON, MISS., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

No vacant beds in State hospitals. Overcrowded and long waiting list in most instances.

FELIX J. UNDERWOOD, M. D.,
State Health Officer.

BISMARCK, N. DAK., February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress:

No vacant beds in any State hospital. Large waiting list.

A. A. WHITTEMORE,
State Health Officer.

DES MOINES, IOWA, February 25, 1929.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress:

Answering wire to commissioner of public health, institutions of Iowa very much overcrowded; no vacant beds available at any of them.

BOARD OF CONTROL, STATE INSTITUTIONS OF IOWA,
By E. J. HINES, *Secretary.*

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, there were 71,967 veterans hospitalized by the Veterans' Bureau. This number increased to 73,270 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928.

The American Legion at Denver, Colo., reports that there are 41 service-connected cases awaiting hospitalization at Denver.

The American Legion at Boston reported to-day that 42 service-connected cases of mental disability have been refused hospitalization within the past month due to lack of beds; that 177 202 (10) mental cases are now awaiting hospitalization there; and that there are in addition 154 mental cases in State hospitals eligible for transfer to Government hospitals for whom no claims have been filed.

The Veterans' Bureau corroborates this.

The Dallas (Tex.) regional office reports that there are 30 men now awaiting beds—4 service-connected cases and the remainder 202-10 cases, which are mandatory for hospitalization and should be counted as service connected. Six of this number are hospitalized in county jails.

We must face the fact that to care for intelligently veterans of all wars is a very big problem. I am going to ask that a board be appointed, nonpolitical and nonpartisan, and if possible a nonsalaried board, to study the whole veterans' problem and make a report as to what is needed to adequately care for the veterans and as to the best method of so doing.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the lady yield?

Mrs. ROGERS. I will yield a little later.

Statistics show at the present time that there are 1,100 service-connected cases awaiting hospitalization, and they are entitled to hospitalization in the Veterans' Bureau hospitals. Section 202 (10) of the act of 1926 as amended made mandatory the hospitalization of neuropsychiatric and tubercular cases, and certain other cases should be treated exactly as if they were service connected in the matter of hospitalization. I will quote that section:

SEC. 202-10, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended: That all hospital facilities under the control and jurisdiction of the bureau shall be available for every honorably discharged veteran of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine insurrection, the Boxer rebellion, or the World War suffering from neuropsychiatric or tubercular ailments and diseases, paralysis agitans, encephalitis lethargica, or amoebic dysentery, or the loss of sight of both eyes, regardless whether such ailments or diseases are due to military service or otherwise, including traveling expenses as granted to those receiving compensation and hospitalization under this act. The director is further authorized, so far as he shall find that existing Government facilities permit, to furnish hospitalization and necessary traveling expenses incident to hospitalization to veterans of any war, military occupation, or

military expedition, including those women who served as Army nurses under contracts between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, not dishonorably discharged, without regard to the nature or origin of their disabilities: *Provided*, That any and all laws applicable to women who belonged to the Nurse Corps of the Army after February 2, 1901, shall apply equally to members of the Army Nurse Corps who served under contract between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, including all women who served honorably as nurses, chief nurses, or superintendent of said corps in said period: *Provided*, That preference to admission to any Government hospital for hospitalization under the provisions of this subdivision shall be given to those veterans who are financially unable to pay for hospitalization and their necessary traveling expenses: *Provided further*, That where a veteran hospitalized under the authority of this subdivision is financially unable to supply himself with clothing, he shall also be furnished with such clothing as the director may deem necessary: *Provided further*, That where a veteran entitled to hospitalization under this subdivision is suffering with a disease or injury necessitating the wearing of a prosthetic appliance and is financially unable to supply himself with same, upon an affidavit to that effect the director is hereby authorized to furnish such appliance and to effect necessary repairs to the same without cost to the veteran: *And provided further*, That the pension of a veteran entitled to hospitalization under this subdivision shall not be subject to deduction, while such veteran is hospitalized in any Government hospital, for board, maintenance, or any other purpose incident to hospitalization: *Provided further*, That the act of May 4, 1898, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, and for other purposes," the act of February 28, 1861, as amended by the act of February 2, 1909, relative to the Government hospital for the insane in the District of Columbia, or any other act, in so far as they are inconsistent with the provisions of this section, be, and they are, hereby modified accordingly.

In the insular possessions or Territories of the United States the director is further authorized to furnish hospitalization in other than Government hospitals.

The doctors in this House know only too well that prompt diagnosis, prompt hospitalization, means a saving not only of human life but it means a saving of reason. I feel I have a right to speak of this fact because I have worked in the hospitals. I worked steadily in hospitals from 1918 to 1922. I have watched the care of veterans in the hospitals in different parts of the country since then. I saw then what prompt care did in curing these service men and women, and I also saw how as a result of lack of care some of them become hopeless cases. Take a diabetic, for instance. At the present time, since the discovery of insulin, if he is promptly hospitalized, promptly diagnosed, he is taught to have the proper diet, taught the proper care, and he can go out in the world and earn his living for himself and for his family. Immediate care of a mental case often means that the patient is brought back to normal. Certainly from the economic point of view it is important to diagnose these men promptly, to hospitalize them promptly. It is much better for the men to have them get well and it is much better for the families to have them get well, and also for the Federal Government. They are, then, not a financial drain upon the Government.

This bill (H. R. 15921) provides approximately 3,500 beds for our disabled veterans in the different parts of the country. The program which goes with the bill, which is inserted in the committee's report of the bill, is recommended by the Director of the Veterans' Bureau as being the one he favors at this time. I am not completely satisfied with it because I believe we need beds in certain other parts of the country that he has not recommended. He has stated that while no appropriation could possibly pass the House and the Senate during this session of Congress, yet if he had the authorization to go ahead and plan to build these hospitals, there would be a great saving of time in their erection.

The Veterans' Bureau states that it takes nearly three years to complete a building program. This statement, however, is not borne out by an analysis of the actual facts. It should be recognized that if a program were to be completed within three years, that the average date upon which all of the hospitals included in the program were to be opened would necessarily be less than three years. For example, if the entire program were to be completed within three years, the first hospital must have been completed within, say, 18 months and the remaining hospitals completed at intervals every few months thereafter until the completion of the last hospital within the 3-year limit.

An analysis has just been made of the dates on which the last 10 Veterans' Bureau hospitals have been opened. This analysis shows that it takes three years, on the average, from the date of authorization to the completion date of a hospital, and does not in any sense represent the time for completion of a hospital building program.

The 10 last hospitals opened by the Veterans' Bureau, from which this study has been made, are listed below, showing the name of the hospital, the date of its authorization, the date of its completion, the elapsed time between authorization and completion and the number of beds involved.

Name and No.	Date authorized	Date completed	Time from authorization to completion	Number of beds
St. Cloud, 101.....	April, 1922.....	September, 1924.....	2 years 5 months.....	340
Excelsior Springs, 99.....	do.....	October, 1924.....	2 years 6 months.....	125
Camp Custer, 100.....	do.....	do.....	do.....	575
Livermore, 102.....	do.....	April, 1925.....	3 years.....	806
Aspinwall, 103.....	March, 1921.....	October, 1925.....	4 years 7 months.....	228
San Fernando, 104.....	April, 1922.....	March, 1926.....	3 years 11 months.....	230
North Chicago, 105.....	June, 1924.....	do.....	1 year 9 months.....	700
Minneapolis, 106.....	do.....	April, 1927.....	2 years 10 months.....	557
Northport, 108.....	do.....	April, 1928.....	3 years 10 months.....	1,000
Bedford, 107.....	March, 1925.....	July, 1928.....	3 years 4 months.....	350

It took 30 years and 8 months to complete these 10 hospitals, or an average of 3 years for each hospital. The average bed capacity of each of these hospitals is 441 beds, in other words, average-sized hospitals.

The last 10 hospitals opened were chosen arbitrarily to obtain the average time of construction, for several reasons, as follows:

First. The Veterans' Bureau architectural and engineering corps is now working at higher efficiency than in the beginning, so their latest efforts form a better medium of comparison than would their earlier efforts.

Second. Ten hospitals were chosen arbitrarily, as this would give a sufficient number from which to strike a fair average time for the construction of one hospital under present conditions.

The 4,411 beds involved approximate the size of the average program authorized by the Congress.

Third. Of the hospitals opened at an earlier date many were buildings which had not been erected for hospital use but which were purchased by the Government and transformed into hospitals for use of the disabled veterans. Others were purchased outright. For this reason an analysis of the elapsed time between authorization and opening of the earlier hospitals would not be a true indication of the time it takes to build a hospital, it now being the Veterans' Bureau policy to construct the hospitals authorized by the Congress.

The present program will not be adequate to hospitalize all veterans in Veterans' Bureau hospitals. It is felt that with these additional facilities and the continued use of the beds now allotted to the bureau by other governmental agencies the Veterans' Bureau will be in a position to take care during the next several years of practically all service-connected cases and the more aggravated 202-10 cases.

In approving the program submitted by the director, there is no intention on the part of the committee to designate a particular location for hospitals. It is expected to place the structures in the areas set out herein at such places as the director may select, but if conditions should be so altered as to require changes in location or allocation, it is expected that the director, with the approval of the Federal board for hospitalization and the President, will make such changes.

This bill has been indorsed by the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Spanish War Veterans, and the Grand Army of the Republic. The suggestions of these veterans' organizations have been very helpful as they constantly make surveys of the hospitalization problem. While your committee did not see fit to recommend all that these organizations requested, it did attempt to fill the greatest need.

I have taken at random the 10 last hospital projects. They have averaged three years a project. You can imagine what three years means to a sick veteran if he is waiting for hospitalization. The Legion tells me, and I know from my own experience, that it takes frequently from one to three months to secure hospitalization for a veteran, and then it is necessary, often, to have a Member of Congress telegraph to secure that hospitalization. The veteran should be hospitalized the day that he is taken sick.

There is one thing I think most of us do not take into consideration, and that is the transportation costs to the Government if the hospitals are at a considerable distance from the veteran's home. Last year the veterans expended over \$2,000,000 in transportation. Last year the hospital bill authorized for the building of beds an appropriation of \$15,000,000. That money has already been appropriated, and every cent of it the Director of the Veterans' Bureau tells me has been allocated. Seven million dollars was appropriated by Congress immedi-

ately after the passage of the bill last year. And this session of Congress appropriated \$6,000,000, and granted to the bureau authority to obligate the remaining \$2,000,000. I speak of this because, on the floor, it was said that was \$2,000,000 available which the director could use for hospital projects. The Veterans' Bureau has told me several times that every cent of the \$2,000,000 is allocated, every cent of it obligated. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention in a few moments to move to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 16819, and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes upon the question of hospitalization for disabled veterans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make the request to couple with that that I have five minutes, to follow the gentleman from South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi couples with that a request that he may have five minutes. Is there objection to these requests?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of the House, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the address concerning hospitals made by the distinguished lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and like every other Member of the House, and I know that to be a certainty, having served here for 11 years since the war, I desire to see every disabled soldier in the United States given hospitalization. The whole matter of veterans' legislation presents many problems to the Congress and to the country. The legislation with reference to compensation and that with reference to hospitalization must be considered together. We have entered this hospital-building program rather gradually. The sum total of appropriations for the building of hospitals since the war is approximately \$90,000,000, which means that for each service-connected disabled patient in Veterans' Bureau hospitals in the United States the Government has expended \$7,000.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. No; not until I finish this statement. The total load in all hospitals to-day is approximately 29,000 men. We started out with the theory that we would give hospital treatment to every service-connected person who was disabled in the war, but in the veterans' act of 1924 we found that there were some vacant beds not required for service men, which could be used by those who were not disabled in the war. Congress passed this act:

The director is further authorized, so far as he shall find that existing Government facilities permit, to furnish hospitalization and necessary traveling expenses incident to hospitalization of veterans * * * without regard to the nature or origin of their disability.

So that the existing law to-day is that every ex-service man of the World War who has a service-connected disability mandatorily must be hospitalized, and if there are vacant beds these men who have non-service-connected disabilities may be hospitalized. For instance, men who last year were run over by an automobile or to-day become diseased may be hospitalized. That is existing law. This has been the final result: We have 29,000 men in the hospitals and 10,000 of them have non-service-connected disabilities; so that if they were removed from the hospitals, as contemplated by the existing law, whether it was wise or not, there would be plenty of beds available for the service-connected men.

I call your attention to this largely because I know that the time is now here when Congress must not only consider this matter in connection with a general hospital policy but in connection also with a policy of pensions. In that connection I wish to call attention to report No. 2715 which accompanies the bill H. R. 15921, discussed by the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and also call attention to the minority views. They are called "minority views" because that is the only way we can file them. But as a matter of fact I do not think there will be any disagreement eventually among the responsible Members of Congress and the responsible service men and citizens of the country as to what must be done. But before this program is carried out, and before we make commitments and agreements, we ought to know where we are going to get the money, and what should be done with it, and how the men will be treated.

All I desire to do in this short time that I have is to call the attention of the House to the great problem and to see that Members do not commit themselves to a policy that may be found to be unsound. When we do agree upon a policy we ought to let the ex-service men and the taxpayers know what we promise, and then live up to that promise.

I happened to be on the floor of the House 12 years ago, when war was declared, and I happened to be on the floor when we passed the conscription law; and I still remember those fluent speeches made by gentlemen who insisted on our entering the war unprepared as to what would be done with the men who would be injured. It is not my duty to definitely determine what will be done with the men, but it is up to us to make a comprehensive study before we decide upon a program.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will yield first to the member of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROWNING. Is not the law now absolutely mandatory that we hospitalize every disabled veteran?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman, as usual, is correct in the statement of the law with reference to these two classes. As to the non-service-connected cases, if they were taken from the hospitals, we would have room for the classes of patients to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BROWNING. Are there not numbers of those men who can not get hospitalization?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes; non-service-connected cases. If the hospital bill is passed—and I have said frankly in the minority views that I did not think it would pass—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In a moment. And time has demonstrated that I was right, because in my opinion we have not a chance to pass it. Even if it passed this body it would not become law. If we did pass this hospital bill there would be no opportunity afforded to procure the money necessary for the building of the hospitals until July 1, 1930. I have every confidence that this administration must recognize the fact that there must be a consolidation of activities affecting the ex-service men, instead of having five different operating heads, including hospitalization and everything else. We must use some plain, ordinary common sense in this governmental matter and put all these activities under one head, and then we could intelligently appropriate the money that may be necessary. There are 11 or 12 soldiers' homes, and the patient load may be entirely different a year or six months from now from what it is to-day.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS. I suppose the gentleman realizes that the Director of the Veterans' Bureau has repeatedly stated that we would not have enough beds even if those of the soldiers' homes were taken over by the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have been so informed by ladies and gentlemen who have talked with the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, but I must depend for his attitude upon the statements he makes when he comes before the committee as a witness. He has never made that statement to the committee or to me.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. Can the gentleman tell us why he is so positive that this bill can not pass the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not want to go into that, but experience here has taught me that certain bills can go through without being fought, and certain others will not pass. I do not believe the gentleman and myself will disagree on what eventually ought to be done.

Mr. BROWNING. If we had the same unanimity of view in the House as there is in the committee, the gentleman would think, would he not, that there would be an overwhelming vote in favor of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not go into that. I can not answer the gentleman's question without violating the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

COWPENS BATTLE GROUND

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and at the request of the author of the bill, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 12106, to erect a national monument at Cowpens battle ground, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments are very much more favorable to the Treasury of the United States, and we desire to end the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill

12106 with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill and Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

JOHN F. FLEMING

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 12650, granting an honorable discharge to John F. Fleming, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 12650, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the same. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

HOSPITALIZATION FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree with the lady from Massachusetts that we ought to pass the hospital bill reported from the Veterans' Committee. I submit, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] who says it has not a chance to pass, that if it is given an opportunity to pass it will pass this House and the other body and receive the signature of the President.

The sentiment in favor of this legislation is overwhelming. It is recommended by the American Legion; it is recommended by the Disabled American Veterans; it is recommended by every veterans' organization that has investigated the hospital situation; it has the approval of the Veterans' Bureau, and it has the approval of the Veterans' Committee, of which the gentleman from South Dakota is the chairman. They indorsed it by a vote of almost 4 to 1 on a record vote.

Why, then, should we be denied the opportunity of bringing this bill before the House? He says we could not get the money for some time. But we want to begin making arrangements for the construction or expansion of these hospitals in order that by the time the money can be appropriated we will be ready to proceed with their construction.

The gentleman from South Dakota says we are taking care of men now whose disabilities are not service connected. He knows that in the beginning I was one man, if not the only man, on the committee who opposed embarking upon that policy. But we have embarked upon it now, and even the gentleman from South Dakota will not stand on this floor and say he is willing to back off from it, and to throw these men out into the cold who are now in the various hospitals.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It would be difficult to make it a question. I will have to make a statement. I will say I would favor the policy of putting all veterans who have service-connected disabilities in hospitals and to equalize the States, fixing a percentage of non-service connected cases that could be admitted to each hospital.

Mr. RANKIN. I can not yield for a speech, Mr. Speaker. The time has now come when we need space, when we need new hospitals, and when we need these hospitals expanded. The Director of the Veterans' Bureau tells you that in the program he has submitted the hospitals are in localities where the increases in the load are going to be greatest in the years to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the proposed bill specify a set and limited program?

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Washington will read the report, he will find that in that report the committee has inserted the tentative program as recommended by the Veterans' Bureau. It includes the hospitals we want to construct or expand, and in those localities where they are most necessary to take care of the disabled veterans we are not able to take care of now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And where is the program that will lead to further needed hospital construction? Will we not need still another program? Do we not need it now?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly! Wars always lead to disabled soldiers, and if a government does its duty disabled soldiers

lead to hospitals and caring for those men when they break down as a result of their war services. [Applause.]

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BROWNING. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think there are really thousands of these sick men who have never been service connected by the bureau, but who are absolutely disabled because of their service connection?

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely; and there is your trouble. You have a great deal of technical red tape by which men are being denied compensation, and as a result many of those men who are now suffering for the want of compensation or hospitalization are suffering from service-connected disabilities. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 16819) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 16819, as amended. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16819) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 442, title 38, U. S. C.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. All sums heretofore appropriated for the military and naval insurance appropriation and all premiums collected for the yearly renewable term insurance provided by the provisions of title 3 deposited and covered into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation shall, where unexpended, be made available for the bureau. All premiums that may hereafter be collected for the yearly renewable term insurance provided by the provisions of title 3 hereof shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury for the credit of this appropriation. Such sum, including all premium payments, is made available for the payment of the liabilities of the United States incurred under contracts of yearly renewable term insurance made under the provisions of title 3, including the refund of premiums and such liabilities as shall have been or shall hereafter be reduced to judgment in a district court of the United States or in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. Payments from this appropriation shall be made upon and in accordance with the awards by the director."

SEC. 2. That section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 445, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 19. In the event of disagreement as to claim, including claim for refund of premiums, under a contract of insurance between the bureau and any person or persons claiming thereunder, an action on the claim may be brought against the United States either in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or in the district court of the United States in and for the district in which such persons, or any one of them, resides, and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such courts to hear and determine all such controversies. The procedure in such suits shall be the same as that provided in sections 5 and 6 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States,' approved March 3, 1887, and section 10 thereof in so far as applicable. All persons having or claiming to have an interest in such insurance may be made parties to such suit, and such as are not inhabitants of or found within the district in which suit is brought may be brought in by order of the court, to be served personally or by publication or in such other reasonable manner as the court may direct. In all cases where the bureau acknowledges the indebtedness of the United States upon any such contract of insurance and there is a dispute as to the person or persons entitled to payment, a suit in the nature of a bill of interpleader may be brought by the bureau in the name of the United States against all persons having or claiming to have any interest in such insurance in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia or in the district court in and for the district in which any of such claimants reside: *Provided*, That not less than 30 days prior to instituting such suit the bureau shall mail a notice of such intention to each of the persons to be made parties to the suit. The circuit courts of appeal and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia shall respectively exercise appellate jurisdiction and, except as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, the decrees of the circuit courts of appeal and the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia shall be final. This section shall apply to all suits now pending against the United States under the provisions of the war risk insurance act, as amended, or of the World War veterans' act, 1924, and amendments thereto.

"No suit shall be allowed under this section unless the same shall have been brought within six years after the right accrued for which the claim is made, or within one year from the date of the approval of this amendatory act, whichever is the later date: *Provided*, That for

the purposes of this section it shall be deemed that the right accrued on the happening of the contingency on which the claim is founded: *Provided further*, That this limitation is suspended for the period elapsing between the filing in the bureau of the claim sued upon and the denial of said claim by the director. Infants, insane persons, or persons under other legal disability, or persons rated as incompetent or insane by the bureau shall have three years in which to bring suit after the removal of their disabilities. If suit is seasonably begun and fails for defect in process, or for other reasons not affecting the merits, a new action, if one lies, may be brought within a year, though the period of limitations has elapsed. Judgments heretofore rendered against the person or persons claiming under the contract of war-risk insurance on the ground that the claim was barred by the statute of limitations shall not be a bar to the institution of another suit on the same claim. No State or other statute of limitations shall be applicable to suits filed under this section. This section shall apply to all suits now pending against the United States under the provisions of this section.

"In any suit, action, or proceeding brought under the provisions of this act, subpoenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district: *Provided*, That no writ of subpoena shall issue for witnesses living out of the district in which the court is held at a greater distance than 100 miles from the place of holding the same without the permission of the court being first had upon proper application and cause shown. The word 'district' and the words 'district court' as used herein shall be construed to include the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

"Part-time and fee-basis employees of the bureau, in addition to their regular travel and subsistence allowance when ordered in writing by the director to appear as witnesses in suits under this section, may be allowed, within the discretion and under written orders of the director, a fee in an amount not to exceed \$20 per day."

SEC. 3. That section 28 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 453, title 38, U. S. C.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 28. There shall be no recovery of payments from any person who, in the judgment of the director, is without fault on his part, and where, in the judgment of the director, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience. No disbursing officer shall be held liable for any amount paid by him to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section.

"When under the provisions of this section the recovery of a payment made from the United States Government life-insurance fund is waived, the United States Government life-insurance fund shall be reimbursed for the amount involved from the current appropriation for military and naval insurance.

"This section, as amended, shall be deemed to be in effect as of June 7, 1924."

SEC. 4. That a new section be added to Title I of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (title 38, U. S. C.), to be known as section 37, and to read as follows:

"SEC. 37. Checks properly issued to beneficiaries and undelivered for any reason shall be retained in the files of the bureau until such time as delivery may be accomplished, or, until three full fiscal years have elapsed after the end of the fiscal year in which issued."

SEC. 5. That section 201, paragraph (f), of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 472, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) If there is a dependent mother (or dependent father), \$20, or both, \$30. The amount payable under this subdivision shall not exceed the difference between the total amount payable to the widow and children and the sum of \$75. Such compensation shall be payable, whether the dependency of the father or mother or both arises before or after the death of the person: *Provided*, That the status of dependency shall be determined annually as of the anniversary date of the approval of the award, and the director is authorized to require a submission of such proof of dependency as he, in his discretion, may deem necessary: *Provided further*, That upon refusal or neglect of the claimant or claimants to supply such proof of dependency in a reasonable time, the payment of compensation shall be suspended or discontinued."

SEC. 6. That section 202, subdivision (1), paragraph (e), of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 475, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) If he has a mother or father, either or both dependent on him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, \$10 for each parent so dependent: *Provided*, That the status of dependency shall be determined annually as of the anniversary date of the approval of the award, and the director is authorized to require the submission of such proof of dependency as he, in his discretion, deems necessary: *Provided further*, That upon refusal or neglect of the claimant to supply such proof of dependency in a reasonable time, the payment of such additional compensation as herein provided shall be suspended or discontinued."

SEC. 7. That the first paragraph of section 202, subdivision (7), of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 480, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(7) Where any disabled person having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent, shall, after July 1, 1924, have been maintained by the Government of the United States for a period or periods amounting to six months in an institution or institutions, and shall be deemed by the director to be insane, the compensation for such person shall thereafter be \$30 per month so long as he shall thereafter be maintained by the bureau in an institution; and such compensation may, in the discretion of the director, be paid to the chief officer of said institution to be used for the benefit of such person: *Provided, however*, That if such person shall recover his reason and shall be discharged from such institution as competent, such additional sum shall be paid him as would equal the total sum by which his compensation has been reduced through the provisions of this subdivision."

SEC. 8. That section 206 of the World War veterans act, 1924, as amended (sec. 495, title 38, U. S. C.), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. That section 209 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 498, title 38, U. S. C.), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 10. That section 301, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (sec. 512, title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"In case where an insured whose yearly renewable term insurance has matured by reason of total permanent disability is found and declared to be no longer permanently and totally disabled, and where the insured is required under regulations to renew payment of premiums on said term insurance, and where this contingency is extended beyond the period during which said yearly renewable term insurance otherwise must be converted, there shall be given such insured an additional period of two years from the date on which he is required to renew payment of premiums in which to reinstate or convert said term insurance as hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That where the time for conversion has been extended under the second paragraph of this section because of the mental condition or disappearance of the insured, there shall be allowed to the insured an additional period of two years from the date on which he recovers from his mental disability or reappears in which to convert."

"The insurance except as provided herein shall be payable in 240 equal monthly installments: *Provided*, That when the amount of an individual monthly payment is less than \$5, such amount may in the discretion of the director be allowed to accumulate without interest and be disbursed annually. Provisions for maturity at certain ages, for continuous installments during the life of the insured or beneficiaries, or both, for refund of premiums, cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, dividends from gains and savings, and such other provisions for the protection and advantage of and for alternative benefits to the insured and the beneficiaries as may be found to be reasonable and practicable, may be provided for in the contract of insurance, or from time to time by regulations. All calculations shall be based upon the American Experience Table of Mortality and interest at 3½ per cent per annum, except that no deduction shall be made for continuous installments during the life of the insured in case his total and permanent disability continues more than 240 months. Subject to regulations, the insured shall at all times have the right to change the beneficiary or beneficiaries without the consent of such beneficiary or beneficiaries, but only within the classes herein provided."

SEC. 11. That section 311 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended (title 38, U. S. C.), be hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 311. The director is hereby authorized and directed to include in United States Government life (converted) insurance policies provision whereby an insured, who is totally disabled as a result of disease or injury for a period of three consecutive months or more, before attaining the age of 65 years and before default in payment of any premium, shall be paid disability benefits at the rate of \$5.75 monthly for each \$1,000 of converted insurance in force when total-disability benefits become payable. The amount of such monthly payment under the provisions of this section shall not be reduced because of payment of permanent and total disability benefits under the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy. Such payments shall be effective as of the date of beginning of total disability, and shall be made monthly during the continuance of such total disability. Such payments shall be concurrent with or independent of permanent total-disability benefits under the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy. In addition to the monthly disability benefits the payment of premiums on the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy and for the total-disability benefits authorized by this section shall be waived during the continuance of such total disability. Regulations shall provide for reexaminations of beneficiaries under this section; and, in the event that it is found that an insured is no longer totally disabled, the waiver of premiums and payment of benefits shall cease and the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy, including the total-disability provision authorized by this section, may be continued by payment of premiums as provided in said policy and the total-disability provision authorized by this section. Neither the dividends nor the amount payable in any settlement under

any United States Government life (converted) insurance policy shall be decreased because of disability benefits granted under the provisions of this section. The payment of total-disability benefits shall not prejudice the right of any insured, who is totally and permanently disabled, to total permanent disability benefits under his United States Government life (converted) insurance policy: *Provided*, That the provision authorized by this section shall not be included in any United States Government life (converted) insurance policy heretofore or hereafter issued except upon application, payment of premium by the insured, and proof of good health satisfactory to the director. The benefit granted under this section shall be on the basis of multiples of \$500, and not less than \$1,000 or more than the amount of United States Government life (converted) insurance in force at the time of application. The director shall determine the amount of the monthly premium to cover the benefits of this section, and in order to continue such benefits in force the monthly premiums shall be payable until the insured attains the age of 65 years or until the prior maturity of the policy. In all other respects such monthly premium shall be payable under the same terms and conditions as the regular monthly premium on the United States Government life (converted) insurance policy."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, time is very limited for the discussion of this measure, and it is very technical. In order that all this discussion concerning veterans' legislation and hospitalization may be found in one place and that the things that are said concerning this measure may be brought to the attention of the House, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the report on this bill and the majority report and the minority views on the bill H. R. 15921, the hospitalization bill, which is found in report No. 2715. This will put in the RECORD the views of everybody.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I can not agree to see go into this RECORD the minority report on bills that the gentleman from South Dakota will not help us to get up on the floor of the House and pass, and I will have to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I will do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Why will not the gentleman let everything that has been said by everybody who has discussed these measures go into the RECORD, so that every Member of the Congress and the public will not have to search 40 different RECORDS and reports to find out what has been said and what has been done. If the gentleman will consent to my request, it will put in the RECORD to-day the views of everyone on all veterans' legislation and save a great search of RECORDS and reading of reports.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not willing for that minority report to go into this RECORD without having an opportunity to answer it on the floor of this House, and I am going to stand by my objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership of the House may in the future be able to find the conflicting viewpoints of Members of the House, I desire at this time to say that anyone who desires to be fully advised may refer to the RECORD of last Monday, February 25, when a bill reported by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], a general pension bill, was discussed in the House, and the debate will be found in the RECORD of the date to which I have referred. I desire further to call the attention of the House, in connection with the debate we have just had, to the fact that all the information concerning the hospital building bill (H. R. 15921) may be found in report No. 2715; and in that report will be found the majority report of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the minority views signed by myself and three other members of the committee.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. I believe the chairman of the committee is advised that something like two years ago there was considerable talk by the bureau, if not by the committee, about consolidating hospitals in the Southeast and possibly the elimination of the hospital at Lake City, Fla., does the gentleman know of any move like that?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would say to the gentleman I do not think there is any such move under way. I do not foresee the abandonment of any Veterans' Bureau hospital at this time.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate that information.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me it is absolutely impossible to discuss in any great degree this technical measure. So I now ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point in my remarks the unanimous report of the World War Veterans' Committee on the bill now under consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. The bill now before the House?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes; the insurance bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. That does not include the minority views on the other bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. No.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the report contains the bill itself. The bill has already been read and I suggest that the gentleman omit the bill which is at the conclusion of the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I shall omit that in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 16819):

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16819) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, having considered the same, reports thereon with the recommendation that it be passed. The bill as now presented proposes several substantial changes to which the attention of the House of Representatives is specifically directed. They are as follows:

1. Section 1 of the bill amends section 16 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, for the purpose of specifically authorizing the refund of premiums on war risk term insurance. The bureau since its inception has always, wherever a retroactive rating of permanent and total disability has been made as of a date prior to the time when the insured ceased the payment of premiums, refunded such premiums. This practice is in accord with the practice of all commercial insurance companies. However, in the Harvey Ned Howard case the Comptroller General (decisions of November 9, 1928, and January 7, 1929) stated that the appropriations for yearly renewable term insurance were not available for the refund of premiums. Your committee thought that the bureau's practice was in accord with the existing law but in order to overcome the decisions of the Comptroller General and to insure expedited action on the refund of such premiums the amendment is included in this bill.

2. Section 2 of the bill proposes to amend section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, which relates to the filing of suits on insurance, by including therein a provision authorizing the court as part of judgments entered thereunder to direct the refund of unearned premiums, and also by authorizing the issuance of subpoenas for witnesses who are required to attend the trials, these subpoenas to run from any district into another, provided that in the event the witness lives out of the district in which the court is held at a greater distance than 100 miles from the place the court is held, the permission of the court must be had. Prior to September 19, 1928, the district courts had authority to issue subpoenas under the circumstances mentioned, this authority being contained in section 654, title 28, United States Code, the operation of which, however, expired, by its own terms, on September 19, 1928, since which date the United States district courts have had no authority in civil cases to subpoena witnesses living in a different district a greater distance than 100 miles from the place in which the court is held. Defense witnesses in most of the insurance suits live more than 100 miles from the district court in which the suits are brought, and although authority exists for the taking of testimony of such witnesses by deposition, this method is unsatisfactory and the defense of the Government is restricted and hampered by the limitations of the present law. This amendment is recommended by the director. The bill further proposes to amend section 19 by the inclusion of a paragraph under which the director will be authorized to order part-time and fee-basis employees of the bureau to appear as witnesses in suits against the Government under this section and to pay them, in his discretion, a fee in an amount not to exceed \$20 per day. The Comptroller General has ruled that the Government is unauthorized to pay as expert witnesses in the trial of insurance suits physicians who are already in the employ of the Government on a part-time or fee basis, on the theory that the payment of a witness fee in addition to the usual compensation paid them as part-time salaries or as fees by the bureau would be double payment to these employees. This lack of authority in the bureau to use and pay as witnesses physicians who are familiar with the cases in suit also hampers the Government in its defense.

3. Section 3 of the bill proposes to amend section 28 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to provide that said section, as amended, shall be deemed to be in effect as of June 7, 1924. Section

28 of the World War veterans' act, as amended, authorizes the waiver of recovery of payments from any person, who, in the judgment of the director, is without fault on his part, and where, in the judgment of the director, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience, and further provides that no disbursing officer shall be held liable for any amount paid by him to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section. The last-mentioned provision, relieving the disbursing officers from liability, was inserted in the statute at the first session of the present Congress on recommendation of the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, it having been shown that the Comptroller General of the United States had held that, although recovery might be waived in so far as the payee was concerned, the disbursing officer was nevertheless liable under his bond for any erroneous disbursement. Although the committee believed that the language was sufficiently clear and unambiguous to express the intention of Congress, that these disbursing officers should no longer be liable for amounts, the recovery of which had been waived prior to the amendment, as well as those which might be waived subsequent thereto, the Comptroller General has ruled that there is no authority to apply this amendment retroactively so as to relieve disbursing officers for disallowances set up against their accounts prior to May 29, 1928. This amendment specifically declaring that section 28, as amended, shall be deemed to be in effect as of June 7, 1924, is therefore now included at the request of the director of the bureau. It is estimated that the cost of this amendment will be approximately \$218,500.

4. Section 4 of the bill adds a new section to Title I of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to provide that checks properly issued to beneficiaries, which are undelivered for any reason, shall be retained in the files of the bureau until such time as delivery may be accomplished, or until three full fiscal years have elapsed after the end of the fiscal year in which issued. This amendment is included at the request of the director. At the present time the General Accounting Office insists that all undelivered checks, which are more than three months old, be forwarded to that office for safe-keeping, with the requirement that a claim be submitted by the payee before they may be remailed. This procedure was established under regulations issued by the Comptroller General under his general authority to regulate the settlement and adjustment of the accounts of the Government of the United States. It is not believed, however, that this procedure properly considers the great numbers of checks issued by the bureau and which, upon failure of delivery to beneficiaries, are returned. It is not thought that a beneficiary, who has once filed a proper claim for the benefits conferred by the legislation administered by the United States Veterans' Bureau, and who very often is receiving current payments on an award, should be required to file another claim in order to secure a check which has been issued to him and returned to the bureau undelivered for any reason. Further, the work of the bureau is complicated unduly, especially in the supervision of the accounts of fiduciaries for minor and incompetent beneficiaries, inasmuch as when these checks are remailed by the General Accounting Office the bureau receives no notice thereof, unless certification is made to a payee other than the one in whose favor the check was originally drawn, and it will readily be seen, therefore, that a fiduciary may receive payments of which the bureau will have no knowledge and will therefore be unable to require a proper accounting as contemplated by section 21 of the World War veterans' act, as amended. The amendment recommended whereby the Veterans' Bureau will be authorized to retain these checks for a period of not more than three years will be less costly, in the opinion of the bureau, than the present procedure under which they are required to be delivered to the General Accounting Office, to be held for a period of not less than three years before final disposal is made of them.

5. Section 5 of the bill proposes to amend section 201, subdivision (f) of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, which now provides that the status of dependency of a father or mother of a deceased veteran who is receiving dependency compensation, shall be determined as of the first day of each year, by the substitution of language, which, although requiring an annual determination of dependency, will not require it as of the first day of each year, which has been construed by the bureau and the Comptroller General to mean the first day of each calendar year. The administrative burden placed upon the bureau through the necessity of reviewing all of these cases as of the 1st day of January in each year is so great that the director has recommended that the language be changed to permit of the annual review as of the anniversary date of the award. This will spread the reviews throughout the entire year, and not only relieve the burden upon the bureau but also upon the dependent parents, especially in those cases where the first award is made toward the end of one calendar year, only to be reviewed, with the submission of such proof as may be required, as of the first of the next calendar year.

6. Section 6 of the bill proposes to amend section 202, subdivision (1), paragraph (e) of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, which provides for the payment of dependency compensation to parents of disabled veterans, by the substitution of the same language relative to the annual review of the status of dependency as is included in

section 201 (f) and explained in paragraph 5 of this report with reference to parents of deceased veterans. The reasons for making this amendment are the same.

7. Section 7 of the bill proposes to amend the first paragraph of section 202, subdivision (7) of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, by increasing the amount of compensation now paid to disabled veterans who have no dependents and who are being maintained by the Government in hospitals, from \$20 to \$30 per month. This amendment would result in an increased cost to the Government of \$643,980 per annum.

8. Sections 8 and 9 of the bill propose to repeal sections 206 and 209 of the statute which now limit the time for filing claim and proof thereof to April 6, 1930. There would be no immediate increased cost involved in this amendment in view of the fact that the termination date will not be reached until April 6, 1930. It is impossible to estimate the effect of the repeal of these sections prior to that date. It is the opinion of the committee that no restrictions should be placed upon the filing of claims and proof thereof.

9. Section 10 of the bill proposes a slight amendment to paragraph 3 of section 301 of the statute. This section now provides that where an insured, whose yearly renewable term insurance has matured by reason of permanent and total disability, is found and declared to be no longer totally disabled, and is required to renew payment of premiums on said term insurance, and this contingency is extended beyond the period during which said yearly renewable term insurance otherwise must be converted, there shall be given an additional period of two years in which to renew payment of premiums and to convert said term insurance. The amendment provides that during the same two years he shall also have the right to reinstate his term insurance should it lapse. There are quite a number of cases in which the insured has permitted his insurance to lapse either by failure to pay the first premium at the required time, or, having once renewed the payment of premiums, and before conversion, has permitted the insurance to lapse. In such cases the insured, unless in a state of health which would meet the requirements for direct application for converted insurance under section 310 of the World War veterans' act, as amended, is precluded from carrying Government insurance. This amendment would, within the 2-year period described, permit him to reinstate his old-term insurance and convert it under less rigid requirements as to good health.

The records of the bureau show that there are at present 100 cases in which insurance has been allowed to lapse after recovery from a disability rated permanent and total, 48 of which lapsed for the nonpayment of the first premium due after the rating, and 52 for the nonpayment of premiums subsequent to the first. In a number of cases the remittance to cover the monthly premium was only a few days late. The fourth paragraph of this section is also amended, the purpose being merely to carry through the entire act the amendment included in section 1 of this bill which, as explained heretofore, amends section 16 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to specifically authorize refund of unearned premiums on yearly renewable term insurance.

10. Section 11 of the bill proposes to amend section 311 of the statute, which was added to the law at the last session of Congress (Public, No. 585, 70th Cong.), and was designed to authorize the director to include in the present United States Government life (converted) insurance policy a clause providing a new maturing factor. This amendment provided that where an insured was totally disabled for a period of 12 consecutive months he should receive disability benefits as though he were permanently and totally disabled, thus authorizing the payment of disability benefits of \$5.75 for each \$1,000 of insurance, the face of the policy being depleted by such payments. Prior to this amendment the man must have been permanently and totally disabled before any disability benefit was payable under his policy. The amendment in the present bill, however, provides for a disability benefit of \$5.75 per \$1,000 upon application of the insured, which upon the happening of the contingency on which it is based, i. e., total disability for a period of three months or more, shall be paid independent of the present permanent and total disability clause in the policy and shall not deplete the face value of the policy. In the event the insured becomes actually permanently and totally disabled within the meaning of the present provision in the converted insurance policy he is, under the amendment, to receive payments under the new total disability clause concurrently with payments under the permanent and total disability clause now in the converted policy, payments under the latter only depleting the face value. This new disability feature is limited to a rate of \$5.75 on each \$1,000 of insurance carried and may be less than the total amount carried but not more. It is to be handled as a separate liability from the present provision for a permanent and total disability and will be so shown on the records, so that the present United States Government life-insurance fund shall not be assessed for any losses to be paid under this provision. This insurance will be paid for by the insured and will not result in any increased cost to the Government except in so far as the cost of administration is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this measure would cost the Government approximately \$900,000 per year. It

is a unanimous report of the committee, and the bill contains no provision that was not unanimously reported from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation during the last session of this Congress and was not unanimously passed by this House at the last session of this Congress.

It was the intention of the committee to present a bill to this House, and, therefore, to the Congress, that could be enacted. There were many matters that perhaps a majority of the committee would like to have included in this measure, but at this short session in a parliamentary body not so far away from here it might meet with opposition and be defeated if it contained controversial matters.

One of the most important provisions in the bill is the change in the insurance features of the World War veterans' act which will allow service men by the payment of a slight additional premium to secure a rider on their insurance policies not at the Government expense but at their own expense, which will give them in the future for total disability, \$57.50 monthly for life, making to these men who carry insurance a total payment of \$115 per month. The \$57.50 additional will not be deducted from the face of the policy as is now done under the total disability act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a legislative bill, and its provisions are primarily for the benefit of the disabled men. I have not the time to speak of all of the provisions of the bill, but again I wish to call to your attention the fact that this bill carries a provision to remove the limitation as to the time of filing the claim for those who were disabled in the service.

The bill last year had it, and the Senate struck it out. There is no reason why a man who is disabled or injured in the service should not at any time file his claim for compensation. There should be no limit on that.

Another provision in the bill which would take quite a time to explain is that provided for the benefit of those who are carrying insurance. The bill, on the whole, is largely for the administrative purposes of the bureau.

While others have spoken of the hospital bill, I desire to call the attention of Members of the House to a condition which will have to be met in the future by Congress. We are constructing hospitals in many States in the United States for the benefit of the disabled men. The load of the insane or mental cases is increasing, and the experts say that in the next 20 years the Government will have 45,000 to 50,000 of these cases. Realize, now, that the Federal Government has no right to control the custody of any citizen of the United States, whether that citizen be sane or be mentally ill. As an illustration, North Carolina has no hospital for those mentally ill. North Carolina's patients have to be sent to Perry Point, Md., Augusta, Ga., or to Gulfport, Miss. No court in North Carolina, or in any other State, for that matter, can adjudge a man who is insane to be confined out of the State in an institution. A man can go to the Gulfport Hospital, but when he gets there—in a moment of sanity, it may be—he says that he wants to be turned loose, and they have to turn him loose, and he goes home.

This is one of the conditions that will have to be met in the future, for it is causing the bureau trouble now. I believe that every man who is in the service, who is disabled by that service, should receive the full benefit of the law; if possible, he should receive more than the benefit, if you please, from this Government; but there should not be any wild method of arriving at what should be the best for him.

There are bills which have been introduced, which will place every man who is disabled regardless of his disability under the provisions of the World War veterans' act, and speaking as an ex-service man I can not approve of those bills, one of which, I think, has been reported, which would allow any man who was disabled in the World War, from any cause whatever, to receive the benefits of the World War veterans' act. Speaking as an ex-service man myself, if I had been injured in the service the Government should deal very kindly and sympathetically with me, but the Government does not owe me one cent because I served it in time of national peril.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman from North Carolina understand the present law to be that veterans who are suffering with diseases that are of nonservice origin can only be hospitalized when there are beds not needed by soldiers who are suffering from service-connected cases?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is hardly correct.

Mr. DENISON. Then, is the law being disregarded when the hospitals are filled up by service men who are suffering with diseases of nonservice origin, when there are other veterans who are entitled to be hospitalized?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is, yes; if that is being done.

Mr. DENISON. What can we do about that, what ought we to do about that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I agree with the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that there should be a careful investigation of this subject, and sufficient beds should be provided to take care of the Government beneficiaries. But remember this, that in the tuberculous cases the load is decreasing each year, and in the surgical cases, I think, it is slightly increasing.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, in determining who enters the hospitals when they are crowded for room, the bureau goes into the financial condition of the applicant, does it not?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not think so; I never heard of that being done.

Mr. MICHENER. I had a letter from a service man the other day who said that they asked him to fill out what he called a "pauper affidavit," and I took up the matter with the department and sent them the letter, and their reply was that they had to make proper regulations and make certain inquiries, and the substance of the reply was that when there was one man who could afford to pay for his own treatment, then the other man who could not so afford was given preference, or something to that effect.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Possibly that is so, but I have never had that to contend with. I would suggest that you talk to General Hines. He, I might say, is doing his utmost for the disabled.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. I would like to get the gentleman's opinion on the question of limiting the percentage of non-service-connected cases so as to keep beds always available for service-origin cases.

Mr. BULWINKLE. You never will have beds available unless the number of hospitals and the number of beds are increased. We have taken in the Spanish-American War veterans, all the World War veterans, all veterans of the Philippine insurrection, and others, and it should be remembered that each day these men are growing older, and that diseases are increasing among them to a certain extent. I would not want to say that I would be in favor of limiting any number that could be taken under any bill.

Mr. NEWTON. The way we are now proceeding, even if we should make a substantial increase in the number of hospitals, and thereby increase the beds, in a short space of time they would be filled up by nonservice patients. Am I not correct in that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. NEWTON. Will we not be faced with that situation, and is there any way out of it other than the multiplying of hospitals to a great extent or limiting the number of nonservice patients?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I would not limit them at the present time, but, as the lady from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] said, you will have to have a study of this question. All on the committee agree practically on the question of hospitalization. I know there is not a single man who opposes increased hospital facilities.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. As I understand the gentleman, he states that the peak in the tuberculosis cases has been reached?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. And that the peak in the surgical cases is almost reached?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. In regard to the nervous or mental disease cases, is it not true that that peak has not been arrived at?

Mr. BULWINKLE. There will be within the next 20 years 30,000 more men than there are now. There are now around 15,000, in round numbers, and there will be around 45,000 to be taken care of 20 years from now.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. As a matter of fact, do not the authorities state that the peak in the N. P. cases will not be reached until 1947?

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina and also in the statement of the lady from Massachusetts. The lady from Massachusetts referred to a bill which I understood is pending that will create

a board to make an investigation of this entire subject. I want to know why your committee could not make that investigation, why it could not summon the officers of the Veterans' Bureau before it, why, through correspondence with Legion posts and representatives of the Legion, it could not make an investigation, because, if a board is created, it means that it must go over for another year?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Are you going to take over the soldiers' homes? If you do, you will add additional facilities. That is to be considered. You have the Public Health Service hospitals. All these institutions should be considered in the entire question of hospitalization.

Mr. HASTINGS. Ought not a committee of Congress consider it rather than a board?

Mr. BULWINKLE. A committee of Congress would be satisfactory, but probably what the lady from Massachusetts has in mind is a board appointed by members of these various committees affecting this matter to consider it.

Mr. HASTINGS. I favor the committee considering it itself, without passing the responsibility on to any board, because, after all, the committee will have to come back and review the findings of the board.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, my feeling was that it would be much better to have a nonpartisan board, a board composed of men who were not paid for that investigation. Then you would have, in my opinion, a little fairer report and a report that the country would consider a little bit more unprejudiced.

Mr. HASTINGS. I thought that this committee was a nonpartisan committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is absolutely a nonpartisan committee. I have never seen yet, since I have been on the committee, a single bit of partisanship manifested. Of course, the members of the committee differ on various questions, but not from a partisan standpoint.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I want to know if this is a slow program, a continuation of hospital building as the ex-service men need hospitals?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The program up to this date is just what was thought to be needed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I know; but I need hospitals for 150 men who are insane and I can not get them.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I regret that time does not permit me to answer the questions and further explain this and the hospital bill. I must close, but before I do I wish to express my appreciation of the many kindnesses and the many courtesies and the sterling qualities of each and every member on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] has 6 minutes and the gentleman from South Dakota has 13.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], who has just addressed the House, will appear in this body for some time as a Member of Congress, and I do not want to close this discussion on veterans' legislation without expressing to him some of the feeling that the majority side of the House entertains for him. His work on the committee has been rendered without partisanship. He has rendered in the House and in committee the same service that he rendered to his Government as a major of artillery in a combat unit during the World War. [Applause.] No propaganda from any source has been able to swerve him from his path of duty, any more than the enemy artillery could drive him from the battle field in the World War. [Applause.]

Members of the House may not know it, but so far as I know—and I think I am correct—he is the only man of the minority party who was ever appointed by a chairman of the opposite political faith to act as chairman of a subcommittee. I had the pleasure of appointing him as the chairman of a subcommittee to survey and inspect the hospitals in the South, and he discovered many things in the hospitals of North Carolina and neighboring States which were of great value to the committee, to the service men, and the country. When he leaves here I know I am expressing the feeling of the entire House when I say the House realizes that it is losing a man of great moral courage and of high ideals whose presence from the House will be greatly missed. [Applause.]

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the opportunity to add a word to what the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] has said in regard to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]. The gentleman from North Carolina has been a courageous, consistent, and faithful public servant. [Applause.]

In the matter of the pending bill it is only fair to call attention to the fact that the action of the committee is unanimous. The support of it includes that of every man on the committee who has been charged in some quarters with being disloyal to the interests of the veterans. Such unanimous support has been the case with nearly all the general legislation that has been reported in behalf of World War veterans since the committee was created.

In that period its advice has prevailed in the matter of three hospital bills, resulting in the total appropriation of \$31,850,000 for new construction. With the other members of the committee I have shared the responsibility for this, approving and urging all save \$2,000,000 last year added to the bill that as chairman of the subcommittee on hospitals I had reported to the full committee. My reason for opposing that addition was one I would bring to your attention because of its bearing on this whole matter of hospitals, namely, lack of knowledge on which to act. This is also a fundamental reason why there bids fair to be no action this year. It lies in the fact that we have been unable to verify the allegations made that there are veterans of the World War suffering from ailments or injuries incurred therein who can not be hospitalized. Again and again I have asked for that information, and I ask for it to-day. I request that so much as one name, with address, be submitted. My colleague tells you that there are hundreds of such cases, but not a name has been brought to our committee.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LUCE. I do so, with great pleasure.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the names of men who are awaiting hospitalization who are service connected. [Applause.]

Mr. LUCE. I thank the lady. I have been hunting for this information and have been assured again and again that it would be given to me, but never has the name with address of one such case been presented. If names with addresses are now presented I shall be grateful. I have sought such names in order to verify the allegations. If such names are given they will be sent to the Veterans' Bureau and if the facts are as represented we will demand the reasons why these men are not in hospitals. Under the law they should be hospitalized. The Veterans' Bureau time and time again has denied that there are such cases. I do not want to act upon rumors and gossip. I want to rely on facts. There may be those in this House who do not want facts and are willing to grant every request made to them in behalf of the veteran without consideration of details. As a member of the committee and as a Member of the House I want to know the facts that a just and wise answer may be given when requests for legislation are made.

The suggestion of my colleague the lady from Massachusetts that a thorough study be made of the whole hospital situation, meets my hearty approval. Also I approve her suggestion that there should be inquiry as to the possibility of some plan whereunder the various States should pay for the non-service-connected cases in Federal hospitals. The need for knowledge confirms my belief that we act prudently this year in not authorizing further appropriation now. Within a month Congress has appropriated \$8,000,000 for new construction and \$3,250,000 for extensions, alterations, and so forth, making a total of \$11,250,000 available for construction purposes in the coming fiscal year. The Veterans' Bureau informs us that this is as much as it can wisely expend in the 12 months onward from the 1st of July next. There will be ample time next winter to provide what should be expended after July 1, 1930. The inquiry and study my colleague suggests to be desirable would let us then act with understanding of the need such as human foresight is now unequal to giving.

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman please tell the Members of the House why he introduced this bill?

Mr. LUCE. I introduced the hospital bill at the request of the American Legion. I believe in the purposes of the American Legion. I desire to help the American Legion, and when I am asked as a matter of courtesy to introduce a bill it submits, I gladly grant its request. Does the lady think I am to be criticized for granting that courtesy to the American Legion?

Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey. I think one should be criticized for introducing a bill and then not supporting the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—the three recognized organizations—submit bills to the chairman of the committee for introduction and the chairman introduces such bills for the benefit of the membership of the House, but that does not mean that the chairman supports everything contained in those bills.

Mr. NEWTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. NEWTON. I want to add to what has been said that it is the practice of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of the chairmen of subcommittees of that committee to repeatedly introduce bills at the request of others for the purpose of bringing the subject matter before the House for careful consideration and deliberation. I have done it. It is likewise the practice in other committees. It does not commit one to the bill or even its general principle.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I would make an earnest appeal to Members to read the report to which reference has been made, and, lest you may not have secured the number of the report, I give it again, Report No. 2715, accompanying H. R. 15921. You will find in the minority views no argument, but you will find a statement of facts that vitally concern directly, individually, and personally every Member of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. LUCE. The proposals therein explained vitally concern the fortunes of every man here; they concern the affairs of the Republic more than any other proposals that have been brought in since the World War; in their ultimate results they involve billions of expenditure. I ask you simply to study the facts. You will have to answer the questions raised. They are here. They must be faced. You should be ready to answer [Applause.]

Under permission to extend my remarks, I would add a condensation of the "views" to which reference has been made. These views are held by the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON, of South Dakota, Hon. RANDOLPH PERKINS and Hon. FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH, of New Jersey, and myself. The full statement should be read by anyone who would share in contributing to that public opinion without adequate expression of which no decision on such all-important issues should be reached.

The issues in question are those of pensions and State medicine for between four and five million of our people. They involve ultimate outlay of a huge amount through the medium of taxes and appropriations.

They were raised by two bills reported on the same day from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. One would have given virtually a pension of \$100 a month to every veteran totally disabled by a chronic or constitutional disease, regardless of its origin, thus bringing in men suffering from ailments incurred or injuries sustained since the World War, whether or not the result of accident or their own misconduct. This would be the first step toward pensions to all afflicted veterans. In the case of those hospitalized it would be on top of \$120 a month of hospital expense borne by the Federal Government, making a total grant of \$220 a month.

As the maxim says, "It is the first step that costs."

The chairman of the committee, in his minority report, pointed out that such legislation, carried to its logical conclusion, would shortly require the expenditure of billions of dollars of the public funds. If the laws are to be so amended, we must immediately face the problem of greatly increasing the public revenue. It is manifestly unfair, unjust, and inequitable, said Mr. JOHNSON, to prefer one sole class of non-service-connected disability cases and pay this class \$100 per month pension plus hospitalization.

The other measure reported, the hospital construction bill, was the response to the first definite expression of intent on the part of the Veterans' Bureau to build new hospitals in order to serve non-service-connected cases, a course not now warranted by law. Hitherto the new construction has all been to meet the needs of those suffering by reason of the war. This would bring in those suffering by reason of the hazards of life since the war.

It was pointed out that the original outlay is but the beginning of expenses. The maintenance cost averages \$4 a day, or \$1,460 a year for every occupied bed. For hospitals of medium size, 250 beds, this means \$365,000 a year of running expense. If the hospital should be used for 40 years, the total would be \$14,600,000 in addition to original cost of not less than \$1,100,-

000, and there should be added for replacements and repairs enough to make the grand total at least \$16,000,000.

This means that every bed supplied implies an ultimate expenditure of \$64,000.

The total of more than \$200,000,000 involved in the particular program urged for authorization this year was brought to attention, not because it is beyond the capacity of the Nation, nor because it should be escaped if duty demands otherwise, but to bring out the seriousness of action by the committees of Congress and by Congress itself.

The House was informed that on the 1st of last December the Veterans' Bureau was hospitalizing 10,160 cases not shown to be connected with the World War, more than one-third of all those being hospitalized. They were costing the Federal Government, at \$4 a day for average maintenance cost, \$40,640 a day, which is at the rate of very nearly \$15,000,000 a year.

In these enlightened days, it was declared, the common instincts of humanity demand that all suffering men and women who can not afford private treatment shall get hospital care.

We do not so much as whisper a word against this outlay—

Said the report—

we raise only the question, Who shall bear the cost? Ought it to be borne by the Nation, or by the States, counties, cities, towns, or neighborhoods concerned? These men and women once wore the khaki. Does this of itself put on the Federal Government the responsibility of caring for their ailments or injuries? Or when those ailments or injuries are the result of the hazards incident to civil life, as distinct from military service, is the responsibility instead that of civil organization of the vicinity, governmental, or otherwise? We are not disposed here to try to answer the question. What we urge, and the only thing we urge, is that it should be answered and forthwith.

The "views" referred to went on to say that the present situation is wholly illogical and unfair, for the reason that it is distributing the burden unequally. To illustrate, the district made up of Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin is hospitalizing at Federal expense about three times more in proportion to population than is the district made up of Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky; that made up of Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi about twice as many as that made up of Pennsylvania and Delaware. There is good reason to believe, though it can not be proved by figures, that the cities are getting much more than their fair share of Federal aid in this way, with injustice to the remoter country regions. To illustrate, in the Edward Hines Junior Hospital, in Chicago, December 1 last, there were 293 victims of the war, and 558 cases that could not be shown to be connected with the war. The maintenance cost for these 558 nonservice-connected cases is at the rate of more than \$800,000 a year.

If these 558 men and women, not suffering because of military service, should nevertheless be cared for at Federal expense, if the more than 10,000 such cases in the whole country now hospitalized should so be cared for, then why not every other suffering man and woman in the land ever in the Army or Navy be treated in the same way?

If so, then at any rate the cost in prospect should at least be estimated and faced. What will it cost to hospitalize at Federal expense between four and five million men and women whenever it may be needed as long as life may last?

The instant need would be to build about 200 more hospitals, at a cost of perhaps \$150,000,000. Many more would be necessary if attention were to be paid to propinquity; that is, to putting a hospital within easy reach of every sufferer.

As to the maintenance costs of these hospitals and the additional expense contemplated by the program urged, only a guess is possible, but if you put at a million, the figure of those who will turn to Federal hospitals for medical, surgical, ocular, aurial, dental, and other treatment (for in principle there is no limiting the nature of the demand), and if you put the total cost through life at \$1,000 each, covering the needs of, say, 40 years on the average, you would have a thousand million dollars as the total.

This estimate would be far below the probabilities, for the proposal is to give free treatment to every applicant who can reach the door of a hospital, regardless of his ability to pay. In the light of the well-known phase of human nature, it can be safely predicted that many more than from one-fifth to one-quarter of the veterans of the World War will turn from private practitioners to the Federal physicians, surgeons, oculists, aurists, and dentists when their services can be had without charge. Furthermore, the Federal practitioners, supported by the taxpayers, will not be the only resort. To-day the inmates of the hospitals get when necessary the help of the best specialists within reach. It may be confidently predicted

that like help will be put at the command of those who come to the doors of the hospital.

The program may not stop there. The records of the bureau show that last year the out-patient medical service reported 38,633 home visits. Where is this to end logically save in home visits to every ailing veteran?

The strong protest of the American Medical Association may be prompted by self-interest. Its merit is not to be here weighed. "We wish" it was said, "simply to call attention to the existing fact, and to its logical conclusion."

Under the law the Director of the Bureau is required to hospitalize every service-connected case, in the State or civil hospitals when there are not available beds in Federal hospitals. The suggestion that this can not be done because of lack of room in State and civil hospitals is hard to reconcile with the fact that in 1922, when the peak was reached, 47,962 veterans were in State or civil hospitals, whereas in 1928 the number had been reduced to 2,416.

It is inconceivable that only six years ago there were almost 48,000 beds available in State and civil hospitals, but that there are none now. As a matter of fact the continued presence of 2,416 veterans in State and civil hospitals is in part due to the opposition to transfer made by guardians, and to the preferences of patients or their relatives.

Furthermore, while the supply of beds in Federal hospitals has been steadily increasing, the demand for them to accommodate service-connected cases has, with equal steadiness, been decreasing. From 21,899 such cases hospitalized in Veterans' Bureau hospitals or outside under contract December 31, 1925, the number fell to 16,253 at the end of September last. That is to say, in less than three years the demand fell by one-quarter. The general medical and surgical cases fell off by a third; the tuberculosis cases by more than one-half; only the neuropsychiatric increased. The rate of increase of the neuropsychiatric cases was 327 a year, at which rate the building of one medium hospital a year would suffice in case need could not be met by altering facilities no longer necessary for other types of disease.

All this shows that the real reason and the only reason for such further hospital construction programs as that submitted by the committee is to hospitalize veterans not shown to be suffering from ailments or injuries connected with the war.

Passage of the hospital bill would have committed the House to the policy of State medicine for four or five million of our people. This most far-reaching committal would have been made without adequate consideration by the House itself, without the benefit of any discussion of the issue in the press, without the knowledge of the people of the land. If it were wise thus to commit the Nation to a policy that would ultimately mean the expenditure of a billion dollars or more, surely that ought not to be done without the support of public opinion and the knowledge of the Congress making the commitment.

So we come face to face with these tremendously important issues. They must be met.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota has four minutes remaining and the gentleman from Mississippi six minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY].

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take one of these minutes to pay my tribute to the ranking Democratic member of the Veterans' Committee, Major BULWINKLE, who is about to retire from Congress at this time. I wish to say to the membership of the House of Representatives that the service men of the United States, and particularly the disabled service men of the United States, had no better friend in the Congress of the United States than the gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE. [Applause.]

Now, in the short time remaining to me, I wish to say simply this: For the third time on the floor of the House of Representatives at the close of a Congress I wish to protest against veterans' legislation being brought in under suspension of the rules. It seems that the powers that be are afraid to trust the membership of the House and afraid to give the membership of this body an opportunity to put any amendments on a bill affecting the World War veterans. The right is given to every other committee in the House, but the leaders are afraid to let the Congress go on record in doing justice to the service men. At this time I protest against it. Let me say again to the service men of the country that the administration has double-crossed them, and it will continue to do so until legislation is brought on the floor here which will allow the opportunity for

amendments to be offered so that Congress and not the Republican leaders will be legislating for the disabled service men of the United States. So, I am again uttering my protest. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VINCENT]. [Applause.]

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a very large part of the discussion on this bill has been in connection with other matters and not at all connected with the present measure that is before the House for consideration. I hope the membership of the House will not be confused by that as to the question upon which they are now to decide—the passage of this particular measure.

May I say that this measure was prepared by a subcommittee consisting of the chairman of our main committee [Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota], the gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE, and myself. It secured the unanimous approval of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. It ought to be passed without a dissenting vote, in my humble judgment.

It has the support of the Veterans' Bureau with respect to every section of it. It will be of great benefit to the ex-service men. I have not time in three minutes to explain all of this. One thing it does is to repeal the time limit under which service men may make a claim for compensation. So long as they have to prove service-connected disability in order to get a compensation claim allowed, certainly the man who has waited and has taken his part in society ought not to be penalized and prevented from introducing his claim for consideration by the bureau by any time limit at all. [Applause.]

Another thing it does is this: The disabled man who has Government insurance can not obtain the benefit of the total and permanent disability provision under our present insurance policies until the physicians of the bureau have found that he is permanently and totally disabled so that there can never be any question of any recovery. This is not the rule with respect to policies in private insurance corporations. They provide, most of them, for three months' total disability; some provide for six months' total disability to bring into being the total-disability benefits.

This bill provides a sane, sensible way by which the veteran can obtain the benefit of total and permanent disability after a short time of actually proved total disability.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I now yield the one minute I have remaining to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], himself a distinguished soldier, to introduce a congressional medal of honor man and a very famous soldier of the World War who is now in the gallery.

A DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House. It seems eminently fitting at this time, while we are discussing legislation for the benefit of disabled veterans, to introduce to the House one of the outstanding heroes of the World War, Lieut. Dan Edwards, of New York City, who won the distinguished service cross with the First Division at Cantigny, and who later won the medal of honor at the battle of Soissons. Lieutenant Edwards lost an arm and a leg in the World War. I ask him now to stand up and be introduced to the Members of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I only wish there could be present in the gallery with Dan Edwards the youngest congressional medal of honor man, Dick O'Neil, who will be leading one of the organizations in the Inaugural Parade. I hope to have the pleasure of introducing that boy to the Members of the House before the expiration of the session.

WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all for this bill. Our only objection is that it does not go far enough.

I object to the gentleman from South Dakota stating to the House and to the country, or to anybody else, that the bill which I introduced to take care of our disabled ex-service men who are totally and permanently disabled is a "general pension bill." His statement on the floor of the House the other day that it would pay some men \$220 a month is so absurd, far afield, that I hardly think it is necessary to answer it.

But we have a few men who are not covered by this bill. We have a few men who evidently received their disabilities originally in the World War, who are now totally and permanently disabled, but who can not get a dollar in the world, and it is to take care of these men that I introduced this bill.

I want also to answer the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE], who is attacking the hospital bill. The gentleman says he introduced it, but he did it at the instance of the American Legion. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts think, or does the House think, that the American Legion or the Disabled American Veterans or any other veterans' organization would mislead the chairman of the subcommittee into introducing such a bill?

Not only this, but after an investigation the Veterans' Bureau came in and not only approved that bill but added \$1,480,000 to it. This hospital bill, which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are opposing, was considered by the World War Veterans' Committee and reported by a vote of almost 4 to 1. That bill is meritorious; the hospitals are needed and should be provided for at once.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to get any time from Mr. JOHNSON, the gentleman in charge of H. R. 15921, the hospitalization bill. I am very much interested in this measure, and I feel that that is one proposition in which the Government should go out of its way to take care of World War soldiers. They made the great sacrifice and came back to us, a great many of them, in a condition for which no amount of money would repay them, and we certainly should use every effort to, as far as possible, take care of them in the best possible way, and give them the very best opportunity to recover as far as it is possible for them to do so.

Now, this statement with reference to having plenty of hospitals that has been made on the floor of this House. The facts will not substantiate it, for I have in my office now a number of cases where soldiers are waiting for hospitalization. They are emergency cases, and they should be hospitalized at the earliest possible date. In fact, any delay is very dangerous for them. Take, for instance, this case. A man with a blood pressure of 250. That is a dangerous condition for him to be in, and unless he gets medical treatment, at least at an early date, he is liable to die at any time. I know of such cases as that. I know of cases where men have lost their minds and they have to be kept at home for a week, 10 days, 2 weeks, and sometimes longer, before they can get in a Government hospital. This condition should not exist, and I sincerely hope that the committee having this matter in charge will use every effort to take care of these unfortunate people. In addition to that, there are a lot of the laws that are now controlling the compensation to soldiers that should be amended.

I have offered myself two bills which are meritorious, and should, by all means, be passed at the earliest possible date. It is true I introduced those bills late in the session, but early enough, so they could have been passed, if I could have gotten a report from the committee on them. One of them is H. R. 16765. This bill would amend section 200 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, by striking out January 1, 1925, wherever it appears in such section, and inserting in lieu thereof January 1, 1930. I think the present pension law would allow these soldiers a pension but it is not so construed by the Veterans' Bureau and they are turning down day after day deserving cases. This would let in a lot of cases that they could not possibly turn down, and it would compel them to do, in my opinion, what I think the law already sets up for them to do, but which under the construction of this act they fail to do, thereby doing these soldiers a great injustice.

Now, in addition to this bill, I have introduced another bill amending section 202, paragraph 7, of the World War veterans' act of 1924, so as to amend by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph, to read as follows:

That statements of competent physicians diagnosing disability act of tuberculosis should be accepted as sound proof in the absence of sputum or X-ray examinations.

Now, these cases run back as far as 1918, and unless these sputum or X-ray examinations are furnished these cases are turned down. At that time there were no X-ray examinations for those purposes, and therefore it was impossible for the soldier to have an examination which would cover that. Now, in my opinion, the Veterans' Bureau should not be so technical in cases where they can not help, but know where a man has been gassed and shell shocked that the disability that he now has should be traced to that. I have one particular case where a man was examined and treated for bronchial trouble and dis-

ease of his lungs by one of the most competent physicians in the city of Huntington. This case was turned down by the United States Veterans' Bureau at Charleston. It was then appealed to New York and was turned down there, and was argued by the board at Washington and all the evidence was presented in that case that anyone could possibly ask for, and then it was turned down. I was present and I knew that it was going to be turned down. I could feel that the board had already made up their minds before they heard a word of that evidence, and I want to repeat now my statement that I made to that board, and that was that the board did not realize or know what their duties were. They seemed to be of the opinion from their actions that it was their duty to, by some technicality, prevent the soldier from getting what he was justly entitled to. I told them that was not their duty; that their duty was to try this case the same as a judge on the bench, and if there were leanings at all, they should be in the interest of the soldier, because the Government was able to take care of itself. But that is not the way those cases are decided, and that is my reason for offering these amendments, so that the soldier can get what I feel he is justly entitled to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill passed as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATES ON ADJUSTED COMPENSATION LOANS
Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16395) to reduce interest rates on adjusted compensation loans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That subdivision (i) of section 502 of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(i) The Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau is authorized, through such officers and at such regional offices, suboffices, and hospitals of the United States Veterans' Bureau as he may designate, and out of the United States Government life insurance fund established by section 17 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to make loans to veterans upon their adjusted-service certificates in the same amounts and upon the same terms and conditions as are applicable in the case of loans made under this section by a bank, and the provisions of this section shall be applicable to such loans; except that the rate of interest shall be 2 per cent per annum more than the rate charged at the date of the loan for the discount of 90-day commercial paper under section 13 of the Federal reserve act by the Federal reserve bank for the Federal reserve district in which is located the regional office, suboffice, or hospital of the United States Veterans' Bureau at which the loan is made, but in no event shall the rate of interest exceed 6 per cent per annum."

"Sec. 2. Section 705 of the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 705. Whenever it appears to the director, by evidence clear and satisfactory to him, that any adjusted-service certificate has, without bad faith upon the part of the person entitled to payment thereon, been lost or destroyed, and such adjusted-service certificate is identified number and description, he shall, under such regulations and with such restrictions as to time and retention for security or otherwise as he may prescribe, issue a duplicate thereof of like value in all respects to the original certificate and so marked as to show the original number of the certificate lost or destroyed and the date thereof. The lawful holder of such certificate who makes application for a duplicate shall file in the United States Veterans' Bureau a bond in a penal sum of the face value of such lost or destroyed certificate, with two good and sufficient sureties, residents of the United States, to be approved by the director, with condition to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any claim upon such lost or destroyed certificate; except that a duplicate certificate shall be issued without the requirement of a bond when it is shown to the satisfaction of the director that the original certificate, (1) before delivery to the veteran, has been lost, destroyed, wholly or in part, or so defaced as to impair its value, and (2) after delivery to the veteran, has, without bad faith upon the part of the person entitled to payment thereon, been partially destroyed or defaced so as to impair its value, is capable of identification, and is surrendered by such person to the Veterans' Bureau."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the World War adjusted compensation act, as amended, by reducing the rates of interest on loans made by the Veterans' Bureau upon the security of adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

A motion by Mr. HAWLEY to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Interior Department appropriation bill, H. R. 15089, and further insist on the disagreement to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Interior Department appropriation bill, further insist on the disagreement to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked for. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. I presume this is satisfactory to the minority Member?

Mr. CRAMTON. It certainly is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. CRAMTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

SURVEY FOR A NICARAGUAN CANAL

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I call up a privileged House resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 345

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 117, authorizing an investigation and survey for a Nicaraguan canal. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the Senate joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the Senate joint resolution, the Senate joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the Senate joint resolution for amendment the committee shall rise and report the Senate joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the Senate joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the intent and purpose of this resolution are fully set forth in the rule itself, which was debated about an hour yesterday and will be further debated under the bill itself. I do not want to take any more of the time of the House, and I move the previous question.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is my understanding that this resolution has been reported to-day. It is my recollection of the rule that it must be reported by a two-thirds vote in order to be in order except during the last three days of the session. The parliamentary inquiry is whether this is within the last three days of the session?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hold that it is within the three last days of the session.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 117.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman wish to make some arrangement as to the control of the time?

Mr. PARKER. I assumed that the gentleman from Texas would control half of the time. I ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent that one half the time be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. PARKER was then agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, this resolution or practically this resolution was discussed for an hour last night and rather thoroughly discussed. The charge was made that there was no reason for this resolution, that the resolution was brought up with undue haste. If you will refer to the RECORD of December 17, 1928, you will find that the Senator from New Jersey made a very long address in the Senate, in which he advocated the passage of this resolution, and served notice on the Senate that he was going to do his best to secure its adoption. If you have read the papers—both your local papers and the Washington papers during the last three months—you will have seen continuously in these papers a discussion about the consideration of this particular measure. So that I do not think the charge made that this resolution has had no consideration is quite fair.

As to the reason for the resolution, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUBLESTON] talked about bugs under a chip. If he can find one, all well and good. He is a much smarter man than I am, I admit, but let me tell you the plain, ordinary facts about the case. The maximum ability of the Panama Canal is conceded to be 54 boats a day, that is, a 24-hour-day service. Fifty-four boats are all the boats that can go through the Panama Canal in 24 hours. The canal can not be used at that capacity in the dry season, so that 54 boats do not mean the maximum the year around. We are now spending \$12,000,000 in Panama on the so-called Alhajuela Dam to insure water that will lift these boats to 85 feet, which they must be lifted from the Atlantic to Gatun Lake. You have to have water to do that. The evaporation in Panama is tremendously great during the dry season. The engineers think that they have water enough to put in a third lock, but that can not be determined until this dam, which is now called the Madden Dam, in honor of the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this House [applause] is completed. How long will that take? The engineers tell us it will be seven years before that dam is completed. We appropriate a million and a half dollars this year to do what? To construct a dam? No; to get ready to construct it. We are building a cement road down there up to the site of the dam, many miles long, instead of building a railroad, which we would have to tear up afterwards. We are building a cement road so that the repairs to the dam can easily be made. When this dam is completed the capacity of the canal will be 54 ships. That is dependent almost entirely upon the mechanical perfection of your locks, and there is not a man here who does not know that any mechanical device is not 100 per cent perfect. You all know that. You all know that those locks will not function 100 per cent all of the time, and the effectiveness of your canal is the effectiveness of your lowest point.

The strength of your chain is the strength of the weakest link. It can not be 54 boats a day. That is too high, because you have not perfection. How many boats have ever been through the canal in one day. The maximum number of boats through the canal in one day is 53. Thirty-five of those were commercial boats and 18 of them were Navy boats. That was a 24-hour operation. If you want to get the facts, they are all in the record, brought out by questions responded to by the governor of the canal, put to him by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New York, members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on Military Affairs. They say that you have an average. Your theoretical spread is between 54, the number of boats that theoretically might be put through and your average. Your average is 19 a day. To digress a moment, do you gentlemen realize that in the month of January the receipts of the Panama Canal were \$80,000 a day, for tolls? We are not dealing in small business. I am surprised that my friend from Alabama [Mr. HUBLESTON] is against this proposition, because, as I understand it, Government ownership is not objectionable to his theory of government. Here is a pure and simple Government-ownership proposition. The revenues in January were two and a half millions dollars, \$80,000 a day.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman give us the difference between the expense and the revenue for the year?

Mr. PARKER. In answer to that, I will say that my information is that the canal paid over 7 per cent on the investment, and that is all that I can say.

Mr. SIROVICH. Would the gentleman be good enough to let us know what the toll charged is for each trip?

Mr. PARKER. I can not tell the gentleman that.

Mr. SIROVICH. The receipts are \$80,000 a day.

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. And with 20 boats on an average that would be \$4,000 a ship.

Mr. PARKER. You all know that your average is not what tells the story, because you have not a constant flow of ships through the canal. You have many more to-day than you will have to-morrow. I have pointed out that the record is 53. Cer-

tainly, if the record is 53, you must have some small days to bring it down to 19.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the gentleman tell us what the increase is in the volume of business through the canal?

Mr. PARKER. Yes. The Governor of the Canal Zone made the statement that he thought business would increase 10,000,000 tons every 10 years, or 1,000,000 tons a year. We often think of this business as being entirely oil.

We shipped through the canal in 1926, 4,500,000 tons of oil. Last year we shipped through the canal only 600,000 tons, a decrease of nearly 4,000,000 tons. So your increase in the tonnage in the canal is not a matter entirely of the shipment of oil. The decrease in oil means that you are shipping more of the general commodities of commerce, and your increase in tonnage comes from general commerce, not from the shipment of one kind.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is talking about the Panama Canal entirely?

Mr. PARKER. Entirely.

Mr. RAYBURN. Let me say this to the gentleman from New York: If he will limit this resolution to the Panama Canal and increasing its facilities in time to come, the whole opposition would be withdrawn.

Mr. PARKER. I was quoted yesterday by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUBLESTON] as saying we could not pass this bill in regard to the Nicaraguan canal. I will tell you why we could not do it. It would be the worst business in the world to do it. There is no man living in this House who knows whether we should embark on an expenditure of, perhaps, hundreds of millions of dollars to enlarge the Panama Canal until we know whether we would expend the money to far better purpose by digging a new canal in Nicaragua. No one knows that fact, and all that we do in this resolution is to provide for the ascertainment of the facts. I agree with the gentleman from Texas. If it can be done, I am in favor of enlarging the Panama Canal and not digging a new canal. It does not seem that the House in its wisdom should turn down a resolution of this kind when it commits us to nothing in the world.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Have the engineers informed the committee how long it would take to build the Nicaragua canal?

Mr. PARKER. No; we have only the old estimates.

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. Have the investigations shown that the Panama Canal can be increased in its capacity and that its capacity ought to be increased and exhausted before we embark on another ambitious program?

Mr. PARKER. That is my personal opinion. This bill does not authorize anything but an investigation.

Mr. THATCHER. Just an investigation?

Mr. PARKER. Yes. You have got to come back to this House after you have obtained these facts and get an authorization to build the Nicaragua canal or to extend the Panama Canal or anything else. This does not bind you to one single thing.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. Have the engineers informed the committee how long it would take to make a survey?

Mr. PARKER. The estimates call for two years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PARKER. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the facilities of the Panama Canal were discussed on December 11, 1928, at some length before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling the War Department appropriation bill. Col. Harry Burgess, the Governor of the Canal Zone and in charge of all facilities of the Panama Canal, was on the stand. I dare say he knows as much about the situation down there as any other man in this country, and Governor Burgess testified that the existing facilities there now, with the ratio of increase in the future as in the past, would take care of all traffic for the next 30 years, and in addition to that he testified that with the addition of one lock beside the two at each point along the canal, in other words, the changing of the locks from the duplicate system to the triplicate system, then the canal would take care of all traffic for 60 years hence.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. No; I can not yield; but I am going to read his testimony to you. Here it is. The question was asked of Governor Burgess—

Have you made any estimate of the time when you will have to increase the lockage facilities?

His answer was:

As nearly as we can tell, the increase will not be more than 10,000,000 tons per decade. We are transmitting 30,000,000 tons now. We can take care of 60,000,000 tons before we need the third locks. That indicates a period of about 30 years before we need the third locks.

The addition of this third lock or triplicate system will take care of 30,000,000 tons additional, and 10,000,000 tons increase per decade means that the facilities there now, with this additional third lock, will take care of traffic for 60 years hence.

Now, gentlemen, we might as well approach this subject from the standpoint of business men, and if we do there is certainly no excuse for a proposal for another canal. If we had a hotel that was actually taking care of all business now and able to take care of all future business for 60 years hence, we would not begin the construction of another hotel. To do so would be foolish, and this proposal is on all fours with the illustration.

Governor Burgess is a capable engineer. He is as well equipped, and better so, to give us the facts as they really are than any commission that could be appointed. His is the testimony of a capable man who is in charge of the canal's operation. He is studying it day by day. His conclusions are the result of his best judgment, and his judgment is that of the most experienced officer having to do with the canal's operation.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Is it not a fact that the canal can be electrified so that they can use it at night also?

Mr. COLLINS. Yes; and I thank the gentleman for suggesting this. The canal is operated now only during the day. It can easily be operated at night, and the expense of doing this is small, whereas the cost of building a new canal in Nicaragua would amount to more than a billion dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I really do not know whether this resolution is seriously offered or is being submitted to the House merely for the purpose of a little play. Personally, of course, I do not blame the New York delegation for favoring this legislation or this outlay of money; but I, in a measure, represent the Great Lakes region, and I am especially interested in the welfare of that section of the country—the Middle West. I would like to know what good the Middle West might be expected to derive from this proposed legislation? I know this, that we have for years been endeavoring to secure a waterway, the so-called St. Lawrence project, but certain interests in the East, aided by powerful Canadian influences, have been able to prevent any action upon that much-needed water route that would be of some benefit to the Middle West. I would like to know from the gentlemen representing the farm sections of the Middle West how much good they can expect from this legislation. I admit the Panama Canal—and I voted for all of these appropriations—has done a great deal of good for the Nation. It has saved millions and millions of dollars to the East and to the coasts, but unfortunately the legislation which has been passed in this House during the last 10 or 15 years—notwithstanding the fact that the Middle West always delivers itself to the Republican Party—has not been of benefit to that section of the country. No effort is being made to do anything for that vast territory, for the manufacturing interests, or for the farmers of the Middle West.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not a fact that the Panama Canal has resulted in giving us in the Middle West higher freight rates and placed us at a disadvantage with the two coasts?

Mr. SABATH. There is no question about that. I will take it for granted that these gentlemen are intelligent and honest, but if they are frank, they must admit they have always deliberately discriminated against the Middle West and the people west of the Mississippi.

Mr. KNUTSON. And a canal at Nicaragua would aggravate the situation?

Mr. SABATH. Well, it may increase the discrimination. Of course, we will have one privilege, the privilege of paying additional taxes for the construction of the Nicaraguan canal or the enlargement of the Panama Canal.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York, who is always ready to protect his section of the country, and especially his city. I yield to him.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Well, I did not rise for that purpose at this moment. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question: If the opposite party has discriminated against the Middle West, has it ever lost anything politically by such discrimination?

Mr. SABATH. It seems to me it has not, and that is because the people have not really been awakened; they have not seen the light, but I am of the opinion that the time is at hand when they will recognize that they can not expect anything from that party to which they have at all times delivered themselves, and that they will ere long see the light and in the future rally around a party that has their interest at heart and that really desires to aid and protect them. I feel that if the money provided for in this resolution is expended it will not secure much, if any, benefit for our section of the country, but we will have to shoulder an enormous expense.

The gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from New York argue that a Nicaraguan canal should be constructed in the interest of peace and in the interest of the security of the United States as well.

However, I can not forget that when the House was considering the Panama Canal we also heard equally alluring appeals. Many gentlemen who believed themselves experts in military and naval matters assured us the Panama Canal would materially strengthen us in a military way, and that it would obviate the necessity of two fleets and be a great saving in that way; that instead of requiring a fleet in the Atlantic and another in the Pacific, a single fleet, which could pass swiftly through the canal from one ocean to the other, would suffice.

This argument appealed to many as being logical. But, Lord behold, within a short space of time after the work on the canal had gotten well under way, these very same gentlemen, together with the militarists, changed their tunes completely and began pointing out to us the necessity, by the very reason of protecting the Panama Canal, of increasing—yes, doubling—the number of battleships and cruisers and of the entire United States Navy. They now declared that unless this was done the canal and the United States itself would be in grave danger. The Japanese bugaboo, too, was used as a club. So the Navy was greatly enlarged in every respect, as was the Army, and in addition the taxpayers have been forced all these years to meet a tremendous burden of added expense in maintaining and fortifying the Canal Zone and in keeping troops there. What I am wondering is whether history is not going to repeat itself in the case of the proposed Nicaraguan canal.

This resolution, in my judgment, is tantamount to authorization of the construction of a Nicaraguan canal, which is going to cost this Nation more than a thousand million dollars—a billion dollars—and this notwithstanding the fact that the reports show that the Panama Canal can take care of the ever-increasing tonnage passing through the canal for at least 30 years to come.

Why I say this resolution is really tantamount to the authorization of a new canal is because a survey has already been made of a canal route through Nicaragua. It was made before we decided to take over the construction of the Panama Canal. But it seems to me that the eastern and southern influences behind this Nicaraguan project are so great that, regardless of what I may say, or anyone else from the Middle West may say, the resolution will be adopted, and this notwithstanding that when we on the Great Lakes and in the Middle West appeal for even small appropriations for an actually needed water route that would be of great value to our section, such as a 9-foot channel in the Illinois River to complete a water route from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, or seek action upon the St. Lawrence River project to give us an outlet to the seas, our requests are ignored.

How long, I wonder, will the people on the Great Lakes and in the Middle West continue to stand for this discrimination? I for one propose from now on to oppose these tremendous appropriations for waterways and great improvement projects for other sections of the country until some consideration and much-needed relief is given our own greatest manufacturing and farming section in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time has been consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 18 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am sorry to see my colleagues opposing this resolution. The United States Government for many years argued through the Congress for some kind of canal. Senator Morgan, of the State of Alabama, when I was a little boy in swaddling clothes, was talking for the Nicaragua canal. It finally wound up by our getting the Panama Canal a few years ago, which men on both sides of the aisle at that time said would be a losing game for the United States.

Just such stuff as the gentleman from Arkansas has preached here was talked 30 years ago; and it has been demonstrated not only with the progressive age we are now living that the Panama Canal was an absolute necessity, but it is also paying 7 per cent profit on the money invested.

What do we care if it does cost \$1,000,000,000? It will make your Southern States worth more than \$1,000,000,000. It will increase the trade with Central and South American countries and will benefit the Southern States more than it will New York or any other State.

My friend from Chicago says this will not help the Middle West. Look at the railroads now running from Chicago clear down to the Gulf of Mexico. Your country is living off of the South, and yet you object to the railroads running from Chicago to the Gulf of Mexico or to the city of New Orleans. You object to the railroads having freight to carry back to that country that comes off of the vessels coming through the Panama Canal and there would be greatly increased freight in case we established the Nicaragua canal, and yet the gentleman says he is against it because it will not help the Middle West.

A man must be looking through smoked glasses if he believes that a great, world-wide enterprise that takes commerce from all parts of the earth to our next-door neighbor down in Central America will not only benefit New York City, but Arkansas, Texas, Mississippi, Georgia, and every other State of this Republic. The gentleman does not understand and visualize what this means.

Gentlemen of the committee, we can not be narrow-minded when we realize this great Nation of 125,000,000 people is now recognized wherever the flag of commerce, culture, and civilization floats. To sit down and say we can not put out \$150,000 to have a survey to see whether we are going to increase the capacity of the Panama Canal or whether it is in the best interests of the country to have another canal built is ridiculous.

The gentleman from Arkansas said it would take 30 years. It took 75 years to get the Panama Canal, and, with such talk as we are having on this floor in opposition to this measure, it will take 75 years to ever get the Nicaragua canal. So it is time to start the survey.

I am for this resolution and hope it will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the Panama Canal was constructed as a military necessity, not as a commercial enterprise. It was built and constructed for the purpose of enabling this country to get its fleet from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or from the Pacific to the Atlantic expeditiously, in order to meet any emergency that might arise in the future of this country. Of course, the proponents and advocates of this defense necessity appealed to the cupidity of the people and put it on the basis of a commercial enterprise in order to get them to favorably respond and do the patriotic thing. That has been the history of all similar enterprises in the history of the world. In peace times it is necessary to stimulate the interest of the people in their own defense by pretending and assuming that the national necessity is a commercial enterprise and will yield golden returns. The Nicaragua route was preferable to the Panama Canal but had to be abandoned out of expediency. The Nicaragua route is necessary as an additional safeguard to our national defense for as the Panama Canal is a lock canal and can be blown into infinitesimal smithereens by bombs dropped from enemy airplanes it is the part of prudence and safety to have another canal at Nicaragua making for an insurance that can be secured in no other way and reducing our present risk immeasurably. The Nicaragua canal is preferable to the people of the Mississippi Valley, and the Gulf ports for it places the Gulf ports 600 miles nearer to the West Coast. I am surprised that southern men here who voted for the cruiser bill, the naval bill, the Army bill, making for enormous expenditures all over the country except in their own sections, should oppose this proposed survey and as a justification for their opposition conjure up in their heated imaginations sinister purposes and designs on the part of its proponents and indulge in bolderdash and tommyrot to the effect that the Nicaraguan canal survey will keep the marines in Nicaragua. Did the building of

the Panama Canal bring or keep marines in Panama? Bunk, balderdash! Flapdoodle! There is not the remotest connection between the marines in Nicaragua and a proposed survey to ascertain the feasibility of constructing another great canal for defense purposes and to meet the expanding commercial requirements of our country. I can understand some of the Great Lakes people looking for the development of the St. Lawrence and not the Mississippi, fighting this great patriotic and commercial undertaking upon the basis laid down by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], though I hold that they are blind to their own interests and indifferent to ours in not seeing that which would benefit the greater part of the valley would inure to the prosperity of the Nation as a whole. Why does he not go to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the relief which he implies should be given to the Mid West? Why do not he and those of his thought endeavor to secure rates that would be competitive with coastwise water rates through the canal, or why do they not try to place coastwise traffic under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

O my friends, why becloud the issue? This is a proposed survey and who can object to finding the facts that will be gathered and laid before the Congress? I am amazed; you vote for bills in the way of enormous expenditures for every section for stupendous ornamental bridges and unnecessary public buildings at a cost of millions, but when it comes to the development of your own section and your own interests you turn your backs upon it. You see visions, and see spooks, you see it as some dreadful monster keeping the marines down there, binding your eyes to the fact and bludgeoning your common sense into the delusion that you can maintain the Monroe doctrine by a policy which would mean that we would not assist in preserving order, and will not permit anyone else to do so. If we will not protect the lives and the property of other nationals how in the name of all that is fair, just, and decent can we object to their own countries doing so, and whenever they will or would do so, that would mean an invasion of, a violation of, the Monroe doctrine, and bring us into military contact with nations that would never consent to endure the intolerable situation that would be presented.

The marines in Nicaragua means for peace with European countries; their withdrawal means chaos in Central America and war with Europe. There are none so blind as those who will not see. There are many idealists who persist in looking at the horizon when they should be looking at their feet. No further elaboration of these remarks is necessary, Mr. Chairman, in view of the report and the many explanatory and brilliant speeches made here to-day in behalf of the resolution.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, I was opposed to this bill when it came over from the Senate. However, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce struck out everything after the enacting clause and inserted in lieu thereof certain provisions which make it practically an entirely different bill. For example: The title of the Senate bill was, "Authorizing an investigation and survey for a Nicaraguan canal."

Throughout the entire bill there was the emphasis, if not specific commitment, for the building of a new canal, the Nicaraguan canal. The Nicaraguan features appeared in the first part of the Senate bill. Among other provisions of section 1 of the Senate bill the House struck out the following:

The investigation and survey [of the Nicaraguan route] which shall be made upon the basis of a canal having a capacity sufficient for the convenient passage of vessels of such tonnage and draft as may reasonably be anticipated.

This language our committee struck out.

The Senate bill contained several sections referring to the treaty between the Republic of Nicaragua and the United States. In this connection there was a provision which in the original text of the Senate bill read as follows:

The President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into negotiations for an agreement upon the details of the terms under which such canal may be constructed, operated, and maintained.

The convention between the United States and Nicaragua, signed in 1914 and consented to in 1916, contained a provision whereby Nicaragua granted certain interoceanic canal rights to the United States. Among the provisions thereof in Article 1 of the treaty is a grant of the right to construct a canal—

The details of the terms upon which such canal shall be constructed, operated, and maintained to be agreed to by the two governments whenever the Government of the United States shall notify the Government of Nicaragua of its desire or intention to construct such canal.

Did not the text in the original Senate bill contain sufficient language to notify Nicaragua within the meaning of the treaty of a commitment and intention upon the part of the United States to construct the canal? Apparently the Senate thought that it did or that, at least, it might be so contended, for the Senate inserted a proviso to the contrary. Our committee, however, struck out the entire proposition and any reference to the treaty.

In section 6 of the Senate bill there was a direct appropriation made of \$150,000. That is the amount of the authorization in this bill. In addition, however, there was inserted this language:

and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional moneys as may be necessary for such purposes.

The purposes, of course, were those set forth in the Senate bill. The principal purpose of the Senate bill was a practical commitment by this Government to the construction of the Nicaragua canal. Our committee struck out this general blanket authorization. If we had not done so, there would have been an authorization for the expenditure of any sum of money necessary for the purpose of making the investigation and survey.

The above are the provisions, therefore, that we in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House saw fit to strike out before reporting this measure to the House because we did not want to commit this Government to the Nicaraguan route either by direct commitment or even by undue emphasis or a blanket authorization of expenditure.

As amended what does the bill do? That is best expressed in the new title of the bill which reads as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing an investigation and survey for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and the approximate cost of constructing and maintaining additional locks and other facilities at the Panama Canal, and for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and probable cost of constructing and maintaining an interoceanic ship canal across the Republic of Nicaragua.

Note that the investigation of additional facilities at Panama comes first and that the Nicaraguan route comes second in the title.

Section 1 of the new bill authorizes a survey relating to enlarging facilities at Panama.

Section 2 of the bill which relates to the Nicaraguan route, reads as follows:

The President is hereby authorized to cause to be made, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and with the aid of such civilian engineers as the President shall deem advisable, a full and complete investigation and survey for the purpose of revising and bringing down to date the reports of the Isthmian Canal Commission transmitted to Congress, with respect to the practicability and advantages and approximate cost of constructing a canal across Nicaragua, and for the purpose of obtaining all additional available information respecting (1) the most practical route for an interoceanic ship canal across the Republic of Nicaragua by way of the San Juan River and the Great Lake of Nicaragua, or by way of any other route over Nicaraguan territory, including suitable locations for harbors at each of the termini thereof; (2) the practicability and approximate cost of constructing and maintaining such canal; and (3) the approximate cost of acquiring all private rights, properties, privileges, and franchises, if any, included in or necessarily affected by such canal route.

Note there is provided the following:

Bringing down to date the reports of the original Isthmian Canal Commission with the object of obtaining information as to practicability, approximate cost, and other information, including approximate cost of maintenance and acquiring of rights as well as approximate cost of construction.

Note that there is no commitment whatever. There is no emphasis upon the Nicaraguan route. The provisions pertaining to Nicaragua are not substantially dissimilar from those pertaining to the enlargement of the facilities at Panama.

I am going into this matter in detail because I am one of those who must be shown before he is going to vote for the construction of another isthmian canal. The construction of the Panama Canal has worked havoc with some of the industries in the upper Mississippi Valley. To-day it is possible to ship a goodly number of commodities by rail from Mississippi River points to the Atlantic seaboard and from there by boat to the Panama Canal and to the north Pacific coast for less than it costs to ship the same commodity by rail from the same point to the north Pacific coast. Some of our industries, by reason of this fact, have been placed at a distinct disadvantage. We do not want that disadvantage aggravated or increased. We have a well-grounded fear that such would be the case if another

canal was constructed. There is no question but what the bill as it came from the Senate would have been a practical commitment to a new route. Therefore I want to say to my good friends who feel as I do about this matter that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done some very excellent work in eliminating these provisions so objectionable to us. As amended, the resolution is a straight out and out modest authorization for information, with no commitments for a new route or even for an extended survey in the event that a proposal should be made in the future for substantially additional authorizations of money.

It has been said, authorize the investigation as to the Panama Canal; but why even seek information on the other route? Information without implied or expressed commitment at no great expense is not going to harm anybody. Bear in mind that we paid Nicaragua \$3,000,000 for this option for the right to construct a canal. We have that much money invested. Our engineers some years ago made an extensive survey and an exhaustive report. With this investment and with the propaganda that is going on for the construction of a canal in another route, it would seem to me that we ought to be willing to spend a little money to bring that report down to date so that we may have up-to-date information. In substance, that is all that there is in this bill in so far as the Nicaraguan route is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the recent agitation for the construction of this Nicaraguan route commenced last summer, as I recall it. I do not believe that its construction is at all necessary, but that is no reason why I should oppose any reasonable effort to acquire information.

Now then, if after the investigation has been made and a report is submitted, this is followed by a movement to construct such a canal, I shall undoubtedly oppose it and oppose it vigorously. We in the upper Mississippi Valley are in substantial accord on the proposition that before there is to be any new Isthmian Canal route or any substantial enlargement of existing facilities for the construction of one, for which we will be taxed with the rest of the country, that substantial progress be made toward the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project and the development of our inland riverways system. The development of our inland rivers through the deepening of our channels to a generally uniform and standard depth where there can be an interchange of freight, is absolutely essential for the people of the Middle West; we need a 9-foot channel. I want to again state that substantial progress along these lines must be made before there should be any construction of a new Isthmian Canal in Nicaragua or anywhere else.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me again reiterate that this amended resolution merely seeks information. It does not commit the Government to the construction of another route, nor does it even emphasize that. I shall, therefore, support the resolution as it has been so substantially amended by our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am opposed to the passage of this resolution. In the first place, when a committee of which I am a member brings legislation into this House, I have pride enough in the committee to want it to come before the House with enough information about the proposed legislation to intelligently tell the House of Representatives the reason why it should be enacted. This resolution came to our committee about three days ago, a resolution involving not only great national but great international problems. It came there and was taken up without one word of hearing, without one scintilla of testimony. When those of us who wanted to know something about the resolution asked why we should vote for it and what were the facts about the Panama Canal as to its present capacity and its capacity to take care of the ships that might pass through it in the future, we were asked to read a Senator's speech and get the information we desired in order to pass on a great question like this.

I am amused at some of the gentlemen here who say that we should vote for this resolution because if this canal is built there will be some money expended in our section of the United States. What is the hurry about this? Why not have knowledge as to the capacity of the Panama Canal? The Governor of the Panama Canal Zone said in his testimony before the Committee on Appropriations that before the Panama Canal would need enlarging, it could take care of all the commerce that would want to go through it for 30 years to come. Then why build another canal? Why do you want to investigate the Nicaragua route again when it was abandoned because it was impracticable, because the cost of digging the canal there was prohibitive. If we want to increase the capacity of the canal,

why not limit this resolution to an investigation of the Panama Canal and that alone? Do you want to have another canal that will increase your foreign entanglements? Do you want to have another canal that you will have to defend, if such a time ever comes?

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. PARKER. Does not the gentleman think it wise, while we are ascertaining facts about the Panama Canal, to also find out if it would be advisable, from a business standpoint, to dig the Nicaragua canal?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not, for the simple reason that I do not think we ought to go into negotiations with any other country in Central America as long as there is a canal that we can broaden or deepen and increase, which we already have.

Mr. PARKER. Have we not already gone into those negotiations? Did we not go into them under the Wilson administration, and was there not a treaty made with Nicaragua by Mr. Bryan?

Mr. RAYBURN. Oh, yes; but this is the first time anybody has ever suggested that we operate under it.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SIROVICH. This resolution appropriates \$150,000 to make a survey of the Nicaragua route. Was there ever a survey made of the proposed Nicaragua canal before the Panama Canal was built?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; and it was abandoned and the Panama Canal was dug.

Mr. KNUTSON. This measure is simply the entering wedge for the construction of a Nicaragua canal, is it not? This is preliminary, and if we want to block it now is the time to block it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think we ought to strike everything out of this resolution except with reference to investigating the capacity of the Panama Canal. I wanted a hearing on this resolution, and the reason was I wanted to find out who it is who wants to open up negotiations with Nicaragua. I wanted to find out what bug is under the chip, and why the United States wants to open up again negotiations with Nicaragua. If we had had time to investigate the subject, if we had called witnesses before the committee who had information on the question, we would have been able to develop whether or not this proposition is a business proposition, whether we shall dig a canal at Nicaragua, or whether the \$150,000 is an entering wedge to spend millions of dollars there to try to pull somebody out of an international mess.

Mr. PARKER. Does the gentleman think we could determine whether it is a good business proposition without having a survey?

Mr. RAYBURN. It has been abandoned once as a bad business proposition.

Mr. SABATH. There is already a survey.

Mr. RAYBURN. There was a survey, and everyone, to begin with, was in favor of digging the canal through Nicaragua, but after the investigation, after the survey, they abandoned that route, and went to Panama, where we now have our fortifications and our canal in operation, and where, with a few more men to operate it, we can take care of the commerce there, and we will then have only one canal to protect. What I protest against in the passage of this resolution, and every other resolution involving great questions, is being asked to support it without information or an attempt to get information.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. I am wondering if the necessity for this legislation could be based on the fear of earthquake or slides or lack of water or any other physical condition imperiling the Panama Canal. Is there anything like that in this question?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not know. We called no experts. We did not know anything about it. That is the reason why I do not like legislation of this character crammed down our throats in the dying hours of a session without hearings and without explanation.

Mr. PARKER. Whom would you expect to give the information?

Mr. RAYBURN. I should expect some one sponsoring this resolution to give us some information. I should like to ask some few questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The object of this resolution apparently is to revise and bring down to date the estimates of the Isthmian Canal Commission. Does the gentleman think

the lapse of time has so changed conditions that the estimates should be brought down to date?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not at all.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. They have had a number of earthquakes down there along the line of the proposed canal. They have them so frequently that it would take a good many investigations to keep up with them.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think what the House ought to do would be to strike out everything in this resolution except the authorization of an investigation of the facilities of the Panama Canal. After we shall have done that, then we can go down there to some other country and begin to negotiate treaties and agreements and to acquire property on which to build another canal. I protest now, as I have always protested in this House, against legislation which is brought up in the dying hours of a session, with no information on the subject, and which is attempted to be jammed down the throat of Congress. Why in this resolution can you not cut out Nicaragua? We must ask the Senate of the United States to do it before we can put it in an appropriation. If the Senate agrees to this and the House does not agree to it, why not abandon it?

Mr. PARKER. Does the gentleman think this resolution ought to be changed?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes. I would rather have none; but if you are investigating merely the Panama Canal, then you are doing something.

Mr. NEWTON. Does not the gentleman understand that the House very substantially amended the Senate resolution?

Mr. RAYBURN. I think the House should still more amend the Senate resolution, so that we will know what we are doing. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas yields back the balance of his time.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman from Texas exhausted his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has two minutes remaining.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that the gentleman from Texas has used all his time, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, before our Government constructed the Panama Canal many able engineers in this country thought the canal ought to be built at Nicaragua. We appointed a commission, which made an exhaustive study of both routes, and that commission unanimously recommended Nicaragua. Some of the ablest men in the Senate and in the House thought we ought to construct the canal across Nicaragua, but Congress at that time decided otherwise.

Now, whether we approve of it or not, in 1914, the President of the United States negotiated a treaty with the Republic of Nicaragua, which was approved by the Senate. That was done during the administration of President Wilson. That treaty gave us the right to construct a ship canal across the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was that done under the Wilson administration?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; that was done under the Wilson administration, and Mr. Bryan negotiated the treaty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. For a canal across the Isthmus of Panama?

Mr. DENISON. Across Nicaragua.

Now we have that right. I am in favor of this resolution. We will always retain that right unless Congress takes some action looking to either utilizing it or surrendering it, and I think that as long as we have this rather incomplete canal right by the treaty negotiated in 1914 it is liable to be used as an excuse for interfering or intervening down there in that country. I think this Government ought to have an exhaustive survey made of the proposed Nicaragua route and find out whether it is practicable to build a canal there and ascertain what it will probably cost. If the investigation shows that it will be impracticable, or shows that it is going to cost too much, then our Government ought to abandon the rights we have there under the treaty of 1914 and get out.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. DENISON. The only way that will ever be done and the only way we will ever get action is to have a complete investigation and survey made, as provided in the pending resolution, and find out the facts.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DENISON. I am sorry I can not yield. I have only five minutes.

I think it is good business and good policy to make this investigation, so that our Government can determine the course it is going to pursue with reference to Nicaragua.

Mr. CROSSER. Is there any such big rush as seems to be assumed at this hour? Assuming all the gentleman says to be true—and I admit there is some force in what he says—would it not be better to have some one called here to give us an explanation of the foreign policy they have in mind?

Mr. DENISON. I will say this to my friend from Ohio: The State Department recommends that this be done; the War Department recommends that it be done; the Secretary of War, who has general supervision over the Panama Canal, recommends that it be done; the Navy Department recommends that it be done; the President is agreeable to it, and the Bureau of the Budget approves it.

Mr. PARKS. Why did they not come before the committee?

Mr. DENISON. They did come before the Senate committee and their views are all in the report. The resolution was submitted to all these departments of the Government and their replies are all in the report, so I think the House has ample evidence upon which to act.

Now, the testimony of Colonel Burgess, the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, has been read here. I have recently been to the Panama Canal Zone. I am intensely interested in that project and I happen to be the chairman of the subcommittee that handles all Panama Canal legislation. I am a believer in the future of the Panama Canal, and I think I know the feelings of the Governor of the Panama Canal, Colonel Burgess. I believe he thinks this investigation ought to be made.

Mr. PARKS. An investigation of the Panama Canal or of the Nicaraguan route?

Mr. DENISON. Both of them. I think they ought to go together, and such an investigation and survey will have to be made sooner or later. If that is so, why not go ahead and have it made now? The sooner we make a complete investigation and survey of the Nicaraguan route and the sooner the House and the Senate are fully informed as to what it will cost to build a canal there, and whether or not it will be practicable, the better it will be for this country in order to enable us to determine our policy toward Nicaragua as well as toward the Republic of Panama. In short, if this investigation and survey should show that it is practicable to construct an interoceanic ship canal across Nicaragua, and that the cost of such a canal would not be prohibitive, then our Government should fully protect our rights under the treaty of 1914 from interference from any source. But if it should show that such a canal would be impracticable, or that the cost would be prohibitive, then we should surrender our rights under the treaty and withdraw from further special interests there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read in lieu of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, will that cut anybody off from striking out the last word?

Mr. PARKER. That is not the intention at all.

Mr. BURTNESSE. Reserving the right to object, in the event the amendment is read, how would amendments be proposed after the reading of each section or at the end of the entire amendment?

Mr. PARKER. After the reading of the entire committee amendment, which is the entire resolution.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would not the gentleman from New York think it better to consider the amendment as the bill and read the amendment by sections, as though we were reading the bill instead of considering the amendment as an entirety and reading it from beginning to end without stopping? If it can be arranged to read the amendment in lieu of the bill and deal with it by sections, as though we were reading the original bill, I shall have no objection.

Mr. PARKER. I simply ask unanimous consent to have the amendment read in lieu of the bill. I do not wish to shut off anybody from offering any amendment that they may see fit to

offer, but I do believe we should have it read all at once. I believe we should read the amendment and then offer such amendments to it as are desired to be offered.

Mr. SABATH. But there are several sections, and if the unanimous consent is granted Members will be prevented from offering any amendment to the various sections.

Mr. PARKER. Not at all; and that is not the intention.

Mr. SABATH. So that amendments to the respective sections will be in order?

Mr. PARKER. That is my understanding.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will not the gentleman ask that it be read section by section?

Mr. PARKER. I prefer to have it read the other way. It makes no difference, and I think it will expedite matters.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, it might not. I do not want to object and have the original Senate bill read and thus waste time.

Mr. PARKER. I am only making this request for the purpose of saving time and not for the purpose of shutting off anybody from offering any amendment they please to offer.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think it would save time if it is read section by section.

Mr. PARKER. If I do not secure this unanimous consent, I shall move to have it read in that way.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to cause to be made, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and such civilian engineers as the President deems advisable, a full and complete investigation and survey for the purpose of revising and bringing down to date the reports of the Isthmian Canal Commission transmitted to the Congress, and for the purpose of collecting the additional information and data necessary in order to ascertain (1) the most practicable route for an interoceanic ship canal by way of the San Juan River and Great Lake of Nicaragua or by way of any route over Nicaraguan territory, including a suitable harbor at each of the termini thereof; (2) the feasibility and approximate cost of the construction and maintenance of such canal; and (3) the cost of acquiring all private rights, privileges, and franchises, if any, pertaining to such route. The investigation and survey shall be made upon the basis of a canal having a capacity sufficient for the convenient passage of vessels of such tonnage and draft as may reasonably be anticipated.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, has the entire bill been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the gentleman that we are reading the bill under the general rules of the House section by section. Amendments will be in order at the conclusion of the reading of any section of the stricken-out part of the bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the entire bill. I am not opposed to it for the reasons given, that it might keep our marines in Nicaragua. I believe both factions in Nicaragua, the Conservatives and the Liberals—and if there are any other factions, those, too—would agree unanimously in favor of the United States coming down there and spending hundreds of millions of American dollars to dig this 180-mile ditch. There is no question about that. You could not find anybody in Nicaragua who does not want us to come down there and spend our money. It is not a question of whether the marines are to stay in Nicaragua or whether they are to get out.

I am opposed to this resolution because it amounts virtually to a commitment to build the Nicaraguan canal, and we will be led right into appropriating \$500,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 within a year or so to dig a 180-mile canal in a foreign country which we do not need.

I am opposed to this whole proposition, and I hope that the Representatives of the farmers of the Western States will pay some attention to the purposes of this legislation. For the last eight years they have been promising their farmer constituents in the Middle Western States that they were about to start building an all-American route, or the St. Lawrence route, to permit ships to go from the interior to Europe. Certain Western States have subsidized the St. Lawrence route, and when and where in the world do you expect to get the money for either the St. Lawrence route or the New York route if you go ahead and make a virtual commitment for \$1,000,000,000 now to be spent in Nicaragua?

Let me say further to the farmers from the West—from Minnesota and the other Western States—I appreciate that they are committed to the St. Lawrence route, and they honestly believe that the politicians in Canada are staying up at night thinking out ways and means to help dig an ocean ship canal

from the Great Lakes to the St. Lawrence River. What the farmers want is a canal. They want either the St. Lawrence route or the New York route, and let me tell you this:

The good people of Canada are not staying up nights over the St. Lawrence route. They are in many sections opposed to the St. Lawrence route. It is the biggest unexploded myth before the country at the present time. It is subsidized by huge water-power interests, and yet the farmers out West honestly believe there is a chance for the St. Lawrence route. Why, the city of Montreal, with 1,000,000 population, has not any idea at all of giving up its position at the head of ocean traffic. The Province of Quebec, with one-third of the population of Canada, is united in its opposition to the St. Lawrence route.

What the farmers of the West want is a waterway, a ship canal to the Atlantic Ocean. They do not care whether it goes through New York or whether it goes by the St. Lawrence River. I believe I know something about the Canadian point of view because I happen to spend a part of the summer in Canada on the St. Lawrence River. I have talked with many of the officials in the Province of Quebec. I have talked with the prime minister, M. Taschereau and have had lunch with him. He is not under any illusion about the building of the St. Lawrence canal at this time or in the near future. There is no more chance of building the St. Lawrence canal than of repealing the eighteenth amendment in our time and generation. [Applause.] It is a lot of humbug that has been sold to the farmer out West. What you want is a ship canal to the Atlantic Ocean, and if you want such a canal you should vote against this resolution which will commit us before we know it to building the Nicaragua canal.

If you want \$500,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 next year or five years from now to build a ship canal to help lower the freight rates, if you want to keep your promises and your pledges to the farmers back home, you have got to vote down this resolution, because this is the entering wedge and amounts to a commitment for the Nicaragua canal, and that is all there is to it. You can not have the Nicaragua canal and the St. Lawrence canal or the New York waterway. It can not be done. We can not appropriate one-half billion dollars one year for Nicaragua and another one-half billion dollars for the New York route.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Why does not the gentleman want the Nicaragua canal?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman asks why I do not want the Nicaragua canal. Because I am convinced that the Panama Canal has sufficient facilities to take care of the necessary traffic for the next 60 years if we put in a third lock. The governor of the canal has stated officially that we do not need more than one more lock to take care of the traffic requirements for the next 60 years.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield, yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is the gentleman in favor of the St. Lawrence canal?

Mr. FISH. I am certainly not, for many sound reasons, and besides Canada is against it and there is no chance of it being constructed. The Western States are for it, but the Province of Quebec with one-third of the population of Canada is strongly opposed to it and so are the big Canadian railroads.

Mr. SCHAFER. The people of the great Western States that the gentleman has referred to are for it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NEWTON. I would like to inquire of the Chair if, after having read the first section, the committee amendment is now in order or whether it will be necessary, under the rules of the House, to read every section of the Senate bill when the committee amendment will then be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, the Chair would suggest that what he has stated is in order. However, the general practice of the House and the best practice is that when a bill is considered by section or paragraph, a substitute for the whole bill is properly offered after reading for amendment is concluded. Therefore, either course would be in order. The Chair recommends the latter course as being preferable.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the last remark of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The recommendation of the Chair is that the usual rule be followed and that the stricken part of the bill be read complete before the committee amendment is offered.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHALMERS. Since the Chair has recognized the gentleman from New York on a pro forma amendment, I ask if the Chair would recognize me for five minutes to oppose the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has his rights under the rules. Does the gentleman demand recognition in opposition to the pro forma amendment?

Mr. CHALMERS. I demand recognition; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHALMERS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I admire the gentleman from New York on account of his ability, on account of what he has done and is doing, and also I admire him because of his imagination. [Laughter.] He says that the St. Lawrence canal will not be built in his day or mine. I want to say to the gentleman that in my judgment the St. Lawrence canal will be provided for in a treaty between this country and Canada within the next four years. [Applause.] I have great faith in the big chief who will take the reins of this Government at high noon on next Monday. He will bring about, with the assistance of this House and the other body, a treaty to build the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. There is not any possibility of stopping that great human necessity. We farmers of the West, 28 States landlocked, that have been praying for what is considered the birthright of humanity since the dawn of creation—an outlet to the sea.

The gentleman from New York recommends the New York route. Over and over again the New York route has been reported upon adversely by the experts as an economic impossibility. There is no such report standing against the St. Lawrence route. It is God's way to the sea from the Mid West.

We have 241,000 cubic feet of water flowing into the St. Lawrence River every second from Lake Ontario, down hill all the way, carrying our products from the West to the sea.

I know we will have some difficulty in adjusting the treaty with Canada, but the main obstacle there is New York influence. I do not see why New York is opposed to this great economic necessity. It is going to come within four years.

Do you know that New York seems to be afraid that if the farmers in the West have the right to build the St. Lawrence waterway that it will turn that great metropolitan city back into a cow pasture or a country village? That grass will again grow on Broadway. Fifth Avenue will become a sheep pasture and the lambs will go unmolested even down in Wall Street. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. They are taking care of the lambs in Wall Street now. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute for the Senate bill be read section by section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the President is hereby authorized to cause to be made, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and with the aid of such civilian engineers as the President shall deem advisable, a full and complete investigation and survey for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and the approximate cost of constructing and maintaining (1) such additional locks and other facilities at the Panama Canal as may be necessary to provide for the future needs of interoceanic shipping; and (2) any other route for a ship canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if I did not believe that the people I have the honor to represent have a vital interest in this proposition I would not take the floor a second time. But, gentlemen, keep in mind that the Panama Canal was built as a military necessity, as a part of our national defense. [Applause.] Never let that escape your mind. And that canal should have been a sea-level canal. Everyone well informed in the history of that day knows that some powerful interests, political and otherwise, had frustrated every attempt to construct a sea-level canal. Everyone knows that the contracting interests were determined that it should be a dam-and-lock canal or no canal at all. Everyone knows that the great statesmen of that day and generation made it reluctantly, as an unreasonable concession, which they were powerless to refuse in view of the supreme necessity of getting a canal, lock or no lock. That canal was built, I repeat, my colleagues, for military purposes as a part of the national defenses and a forti-

ori, as the lawyers say, we need a second canal to insure that defense, which is just as pressing to-day as then, if not more so, in view of the development of airplanes, bombing planes, and airplane carriers. And keep in mind, we do not own the Panama Canal, and I rest on that proposition with all of its tremendous implications and inferences. You know that President Wilson, in language unmistakable and unforgettable, asked Congress to repeal the toll provisions in the Panama Canal act. That message indicated to many of his countrymen that he was acting under some great stress or felt a menacing attitude from some country beyond the Atlantic Ocean. We do not own the canal! President Wilson's interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and the repeal by the Congress of the Panama Canal toll act indicate that we agree that we are not in that control which goes to ownership.

The debate has taken a wide range, but it is on the anvil of discussion, the spark of truth will fly, though some hold that too much discussion obscures if it does not entirely conceal the truth.

Therefore let us act and pass this resolution for a survey and if necessary let us dig this other canal, which will prevent war, which will not cost one-hundredth part of the cost of the World War to us, and which will bind us to Nicaragua, for be it remembered that the press carried the pleasing news when the President elect was down there on his good-will trip that the officials there indicated to him their pleasure and satisfaction at the construction of the prospective canal. And by whom will the survey be made? By the same sort of a commission that is in control of the flood works in the Mississippi Valley, which everyone knows will cost approximately \$500,000,000. If that sort of a commission can undertake and execute the greatest domestic work in the history of the country, why can it not be trusted to make a survey at a cost of \$150,000?

Mr. Chairman, I am for waterways. I am for the St. Lawrence project, if you can get the preliminaries settled by agreement with Canada. I am for the development of the Mississippi River and its wonderful tributaries. I am for the development of all waterways. It will expand our commerce and make for the glory and the grandeur of this country. I appeal to my southern colleagues not to turn down a proposition which makes for the development of their section, which will lead to a waterway connection that will give us in a few years vast returns and make for an opulence and a splendor that can come only with utilization of every available avenue of commerce. Do not turn your backs on your interests out of a mere fetish worship of some visionary, idealistic notion that you are hugging to your souls and remote from the practical demands of your own civilization. [Applause.]

Do not strain your vision for base purposes and sinister designs in the conduct of those who are seeking to secure the national defense and make for the acquisition of another canal if the survey and investigation show one to be necessary. The returns on the new canal, if built, would in my judgment exceed the amount expended for its construction. Do not question too searchingly the motives of those who honestly believe in a progress which may not appeal to you. There is no "bug under the chip," unless there is a bug under the chip in your opposition to a survey which will discover facts that have come into existence since the old survey and upon which we can predicate the future.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to cause to be made, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and with the aid of such civilian engineers as the President shall deem advisable, a full and complete investigation and survey for the purpose of revising and bringing down to date the reports of the Isthmian Canal Commission transmitted to Congress, with respect to the practicability and advantages and approximate cost of constructing a canal across Nicaragua, and for the purpose of obtaining all additional available information respecting (1) the most practical route for an interoceanic ship canal across the Republic of Nicaragua by way of the San Juan River and the Great Lake of Nicaragua, or by way of any other route over Nicaraguan territory, including suitable locations for harbors at each of the termini thereof; (2) the practicability and approximate cost of constructing and maintaining such canal; and (3) the approximate cost of acquiring all private rights, properties, privileges, and franchises, if any, included in or necessarily affected by such canal route.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered to the committee amendment by Mr. BURTNESS: Page 5, line 6, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am offering this amendment in all sincerity, and yet I admit that it is done with some hesitation.

I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] that the resolution reported by way of a substitute by the House committee is a great improvement over the Senate resolution. It is because I was, with others, instrumental in greatly improving the resolution by the committee amendment that I hesitate in asking further to strike out section 2. The Senate resolution as it came to the House, it seemed to some of us at least, was an absolute commitment on the part of this country, or would have been construed as such, to the building of the Nicaraguan Canal. You will note that the amendment proposed by the committee makes the Nicaraguan survey in a way secondary, and puts provisions into the first section of the resolution for an investigation to determine what can be done at the Panama Canal by building new locks and additional facilities of any sort so as to take care of the shipping needs of the future, making the survey of the Panama Canal paramount. And yet when we come to section 2 we find in it a very definite provision with reference to the Nicaraguan Canal, which might also be construed by many as a commitment to the building thereof. Surely we can well imagine that in a year or two from now our good friend from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR], who made such an excellent speech here a few minutes ago, from his viewpoint, would at least argue very specifically, in the event of the passage of this resolution, that we are committed to such purpose, if for no other reason than as a military necessity. The speech made by him would give some justification for that contention.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. I can not yield now. Let us see what my amendment would do. I submit, if you strike out section 2, you retain everything that is reasonably necessary, whether it be for investigating what may be the need for enlarging the Panama Canal, as well as what may be reasonably proper and necessary at this time in the matter of surveying routes for ship canals between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, because I call your attention to subdivision 2, found on page 5, in line 4 of that page.

You still have a general provision there so that the engineers of the War Department and the civilian engineers may use this money to the limit of \$150,000, as now proposed, for the general purpose of making a reasonably accurate survey and informing the people of this country as to the results thereof. Of course, that was not the intent of the survey provided by the Senate bill, and I doubt whether it is the intent of the survey provided by section 2. The Senate resolution laid its main emphasis on the Nicaraguan route, appropriated \$150,000 to start with, and made the sky the limit with reference to future appropriations to complete the work. No one knows to-day whether the cost of those surveys will amount to half a million dollars or five million dollars. I think every member of the committee will agree that \$150,000 can not possibly provide for the cost of the surveys contemplated by section 2, in addition to the survey of the facts with reference to the Panama Canal, contemplated by section 1, and when an attempt is made to make that limitation, it becomes more or less of a camouflage, if all of the purposes of the resolution are going to be carried out.

Remember this, also. If you vote to retain section 2 in the resolution, our adopting it will not necessarily mean it will be enacted in this way. It will have to go to conference, and you will be conferring there with the other body upon the malicious provisions that are found in the Senate resolution which would not only commit us to the building of the Nicaraguan canal but is a mandate to the President of the United States to enter into negotiations not only with Nicaragua but also with other countries, to do what?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, in the Senate resolution there is a mandate to the effect that the President shall open up negotiations with Nicaragua that will absolutely decide the details under which the canal shall be operated if it is constructed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not the gentleman think that the provision in the Senate resolution, the second paragraph on page 3, is a wise provision to include in the resolution pending here?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes. I would not object to that at all. I think it would be a rather wise provision.

Mr. Chairman, out in the Northwest where the burden of the cost of the Panama Canal weighs more heavily on the people than anywhere else in the country, in the manner of higher transportation costs on our products, we are not opposed to providing facilities that will make it possible for our commerce and for our naval ships or for any other commerce that needs a canal to pass from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Not at all. But we do say this, that I think the entire Middle West and the Northwest are ready to give notice to the country that we are not going to entertain a proposition of actually building a second canal until we shall have found an outlet from the Great Lakes to the sea.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I want information. I want to know what is the present capacity of the Panama Canal to take care of the ships that want to go through there now.

Mr. BURTNESS. That has been given several times. We had no formal hearings on it in our committee, but I understand that the average number of ships going through per day is about 19 with a maximum capacity of 54. Additional facilities can be provided. We are already committed in a way to the enlargement of the facilities of the Panama Canal, for otherwise why are we spending money in the appropriation bills from year to year to build a dam across the Chagres River to impound water there to add to the water of the Panama Canal? It is believed that when that water becomes available it will take care of another set of locks. That is the information I have. One additional set of locks will practically double the capacity of the canal.

Mr. RAMSEYER. From the information before your committee, is there any commercial need for another canal at this time?

Mr. BURTNESS. Absolutely not; and there is no existing emergency. If additional facilities that might be built at Panama under a survey such as provided in section 1, it would probably take care of the needs for from 30 to 50 years. Such a survey alone will take a few months. Let us get information on that first, and upon obtaining that information let us proceed to do what ought to be done. We can then determine in a more judicial way than now possible whether we should provide for a Nicaraguan survey in addition.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is there any information before the committee indicating the necessity of enlarging the Panama Canal?

Mr. BURTNESS. There was not a single witness that appeared before the committee on that point, and the best information I know of with reference to the subject can be found not in the hearings on this resolution, but in the hearings had before the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the Appropriations Committee. I do know there is no emergency now existing.

Mr. RAMSEYER. What was the cost mentioned in the report of the committee on the Nicaraguan project?

Mr. BURTNESS. I do not know what the cost could or would be. I doubt whether anyone knows. Personally, in so far as dealing with the proposed Nicaraguan route is concerned, I do not believe there is any justification for it. I think, however, there is ample justification and ground for getting complete information as to the cost and practicability of providing enlarged facilities in the Panama Canal project as provided by section 1 of this bill. I think it would be a worth-while piece of legislation. If it is enacted, the Chief of Engineers and the President can proceed to determine in a scientific and engineering way just what we can accomplish at Panama in the way of providing additional facilities. They can also give to the country and to Congress their best judgment, after thorough economic surveys, of the shipping needs of the future. It will then be early enough to decide about a Nicaraguan survey.

For these reasons I urge that section 2 be stricken from the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I find that on this occasion I regret that I am not in agreement with a great many of my colleagues with whom I generally agree and with whom I often find myself in the minority. I do not look at this resolution in the light of solely military purpose, but am attracted to it for

its useful commercial purposes and its tremendous peace potentialities.

This proposition has nothing to do with any other canal, so it is only confusing the issue to bring in a discussion of any other canal at this time. We eventually will build this canal and we will also build other great canals.

Now, gentlemen, it is stated that at the present time we do not need additional canal facilities down on the Isthmus. That may be true, but as legislators here we have more important duties than passing private bills for the relief of John Jones or John Smith, and a legislator is not worth his salt unless he has sufficient vision to look 50, 75, or even 100 years into the future. [Applause.] The very opposition here to-day indicates that even after the survey is completed it will take many years before we will be able to start the actual digging of this canal. There is nothing in the argument that we will not have sufficient funds with which to undertake this project and another canal project for the reason that if there is one thing this country has too much of it is money. I would sooner see our enormous surplus expended in such useful projects beneficial to all humanity than in a race of competitive armaments.

I want to say that in addition to the so-called military necessity I look at this project as another great agency of peace. It can not be said that the Panama Canal, which brought us nearer to the Orient, has in any way stimulated war. The Panama Canal brought peace, and the nearer we can get to the people of other nations the greater will be the hope for permanent peace.

I want to say to my colleagues in the Democratic Party that when the history of the world is written by the next generation, if there is one man who will have a glorious page in that history for his sincere efforts toward world peace it is your own William Jennings Bryan [applause], and he initiated this very project. That being so it is quite consistent that some of us, who are bending every effort to keep our country from engaging in the race for armament and keeping our country from becoming a militaristic nation, should indorse this project. We see in it not a threatened danger of war but a real agency for bringing the people of the world closer together and, therefore, being a greater agency of peace.

This is the age of great undertakings. After all to what better purpose can we devote our enormous resources than to apply the ingenuity of man of this enlightened day to correcting the defects of nature and thus bringing the people of the world not only closer to each other but also to a better understanding of each other. If the Nicaragua canal will be needed 60 years from now it is our duty to pass this resolution to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. MAPES. I desire to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for five minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. There was one speech in favor of the amendment and two gentlemen have already spoken against the amendment. I am for the amendment, and I am not entitled to be recognized now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan, as the Chair understands, rises in opposition to the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I was under the impression that the gentleman desired to speak against the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I rose to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNESS] to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan for that purpose.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the committee, I am in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway, but for the life of me I can not see what that has to do with the resolution before the committee to-day. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNESS], who made the motion to strike out section 2, says that the passage of this resolution will commit Congress to the proposition of building a Nicaraguan canal. In that he differs from the author of the resolution, Senator Edge, who says that the only purpose of the resolution is to obtain information.

A great many Members seem to think there is something sinister back of this resolution. If there is it does not appear on

its face. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] asked the gentleman from North Dakota what is the cause of it, and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURNES] and others seem to attempt to convey the impression that there is something back of it. The cause of it, the reason for it, is to seek information. Members are justified in scrutinizing every piece of legislation that comes before the House to find out what, if anything, there is back of it. No one can take any exception to that policy; but at the same time they ought not to see things where there is nothing to be seen. This resolution simply provides that Army and civilian engineers shall examine these two routes and make a report back to Congress of what they find. That is all there is to it. No stretch of the imagination can find anything else in it. The author of the resolution in the Senate, Senator EDGE, says:

The joint resolution provides simply and alone for information. It does not establish any policy at all.

In that statement he differs from the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURNES]:

It provides that Congress and the country shall be informed through an investigation to be made by the Board of Engineers as to the practicability and feasibility of taking advantage of the right of way which we purchased from the Government of Nicaragua to construct an inter-oceanic canal across the Isthmus at that point; likewise, to be given all information as to the feasibility and practicability of increasing the facilities of the Panama Canal. It has been suggested that it might be possible to install a third set of locks at Panama and thus increase the facilities of the Panama Canal approximately one-third.

Now, dismissing these bugaboos that some people have in their minds, all the resolution proposes to do is to authorize the engineers to survey the situation and make a report so that the Congress and the country will know what the situation is.

Mr. RAMSEYER and Mr. SABATH rose.

Mr. MAPES. I am sorry, but I have not the time to yield.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I want to ask a pertinent question for information.

Mr. MAPES. I am sorry, but I have not the time to yield.

The question has been asked, What is the need of this survey; what is the need of additional canal facilities at the Isthmus? And there have been some answers here to the effect that it will be 60 years before there will be any necessity for additional canal facilities at the Isthmus.

Gentlemen who make such statements are undoubtedly sincere. They make them in good faith and believe them to be true, but such statements should be understood for what they are. They are merely expressions of opinion and not statements of fact. There are great differences of opinion about the present facilities of the canal being sufficient even 10 years from now. As Senator EDGE well said in his speech on this resolution in the Senate, "Estimates, of course, are nothing but guesswork," and the traffic in the Panama Canal has doubled in every 5-year cycle since it was opened.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. For the first 5 years it was a certain amount, the next 5 years it was twice as much as it was the first 5, the next 5 years it was twice what it was the preceding 5, and so on.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I am sorry, but I have not the time.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is right on that point.

Mr. MAPES. I quote from the speech of Senator EDGE. I am sorry I have not the time to yield, I will say to the gentleman.

We can not visualize commercial traffic for 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 years—

Said Senator EDGE.

What sounder proposition was ever made?

We can not visualize commercial traffic for 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 years. The fact remains that in each cycle of five years since the canal has been operating, the traffic has more than doubled. * * * It is coming along with such rapidity that surely there can not be any reasonable objection to getting all the information in order to be prepared for a final decision on the part of Congress as to our future canal policy. That is all this joint resolution does.

That is the statement of the proponent of the resolution, Senator EDGE. Let me quote the Senator from Tennessee, Senator McKELLAR, who refers to a statement by his colleague, Senator KENDRICK, of Wyoming. Senator McKELLAR, speaking of the

conditions and about the need of this survey and of additional canal facilities, says:

The Senator from Wyoming, Mr. KENDRICK, is exactly right when he says that the Panama Canal will be used to its utmost limit of capacity in six or seven years.

See how widely opinions differ as to the capacity of the canal at present to take care of the future needs? Senator McKELLAR and Senator KENDRICK say that it will be used to its utmost capacity in six or seven years. Senator McKELLAR continued:

It will be but a very short time until that happens; and it is absolutely necessary that something should be done at once to provide increased canal facilities.

Now that is the situation. This resolution simply provides for a survey and for a report on the two propositions.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I trust the gentleman will not make that motion until I have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I may want to talk some myself.

Mr. PARKER. I will amend the motion in order to allow the gentleman to have five minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall claim recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I expressed my views on this bill last night and had not intended to say anything more.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has fallen into a gross error with reference to the rate of increase in the use of the Panama Canal. I hold in my hand the report of the Senate committee on this bill. It carries a table on the use of the canal which I assume comes from some reliable source, and I read it, as follows:

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Number of transits	Panama Canal net tonnage	Tolls	Tons of cargo
1915.....	1,075	3,792,572	\$4,367,550.19	4,888,454
1916.....	758	2,396,162	2,408,089.62	3,094,114
1917.....	1,803	5,798,557	5,627,463.05	7,058,563
1918.....	2,069	6,574,073	6,438,853.15	7,582,031
1919.....	2,024	6,124,990	6,172,828.59	6,916,621
1920.....	2,478	8,546,044	8,513,933.15	9,374,499
1921.....	2,892	11,415,876	11,276,889.91	11,599,214
1922.....	2,736	11,417,459	11,197,832.41	10,884,910
1923.....	3,967	18,605,786	17,508,414.85	19,567,875
1924.....	5,230	26,148,878	24,290,963.54	26,994,710
1925.....	4,673	22,855,151	21,400,523.51	23,958,836
1926.....	5,197	24,774,591	22,931,055.98	26,037,448
1927.....	5,475	26,227,815	24,228,830.11	27,748,215

It purports to give us the business of the canal for every year since 1915. It plainly shows that there has been little increase in the use of the canal since 1924. There was a falling off in 1925 and 1926 below the amount of 1924. In 1927 the use of the canal again came up until it slightly exceeded the use of 1924.

Now, I want to say further, this: We do not object to any investigation gentlemen may want to make with reference to the Panama Canal, and its enlargement. The amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURNES] contemplates merely striking out the reference to the Nicaragua end of the proposition. That is what we want to eliminate.

Let us consider the matter like sensible men. We are appropriating here \$150,000 and have provided that with that sum an investigation shall be made of the Nicaraguan route, of the San Blas route, and also of the Panama route. That sum is probably not sufficient to pay more than one-tenth of the cost of all that work. It is not sufficient to do what is required to be done at Panama alone. It will take a matter of five years and probably more to complete the entire three investigations included in this bill. If we should confine this bill to Panama alone, that money and more could be spent in the Panama investigation, and yet the investigation will not have been completed by the time Congress assembles again and probably not for a year or two thereafter. There will be plenty of time in which to pass a measure and to make new appropriations for the San Blas and the Nicaraguan routes.

These two projects are an unnecessary part and do not belong in the bill. Therefore I say as I stated last night that we can not escape the conclusion that there is "a bug under the chip," and that the full purpose of the bill has not been

disclosed. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] twitted me that I was "too suspicious," that I was looking for something sinister in everything. Let me say to him that "a burnt child dreads the fire." I was not born yesterday. I have been misled before, and therefore I am afraid. I advise every Member of the House if they want to act advisedly on this measure to get more information before they act. Ask some one to tell you why the Nicaraguan route was put into this bill. I asked it last night. I challenged the chairman of the committee, and every Member who advocated the bill to give a single reason for the haste with which they were pressing it forward. I got no answer, nothing but silence. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired; all time has expired, and the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURTNESS) there were 50 ayes and 110 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. The President is hereby requested to report to the Congress not later than two years from the approval of this resolution the results of the investigations and surveys hereby authorized, together with such recommendations in connection therewith as he may deem advisable.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The proponents of this resolution have placed it before you, but have refused to give you any information. I took the trouble to send a radiogram to the American Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, and I would appreciate the attention of the House to the reading of his reply. The following is the radiogram received a few minutes ago from the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone. It is addressed to me; in reply to a radiogram I sent yesterday for information as to the facilities of the Panama Canal. This radiogram was received at 2 p. m. to-day, and was sent from Balboa Heights, Panama Canal, March 1, 1929:

Making all allowances such as for locks overhaul periods, present capacity of the Panama Canal is 60,000,000 tons per year. Traffic last year was something less than 30,000,000 tons. According to best estimate that is now possible the growth of traffic will not exceed 10,000,000 tons per decade, which indicates third set of locks will be required in about 30 years, but to construct in such manner as to cause minimum interference with traffic their construction should be undertaken at least 10 years before actually required. I have stated that constant study should be made by the canal administration of growth of traffic in order that Congress may be informed in ample time to provide for construction of third set of locks. The present water supply is sufficient to operate existing locks, although for more satisfactory navigation Alhajuela Reservoir should be completed as soon as possible. Congress has already authorized beginning of this work, but appropriations have been small. Subsequent to completion of this reservoir water supply will be ample for third set of locks, giving Panama Canal traffic capacity of 100,000,000 tons per year.

BURGESS.

FRIDAY—11 a. m.

One hundred million tons is over three times the traffic needs at the present time, and, further, in spite of all that Senator EDGE has said, according to the reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here to-day, the Governor of the Canal Zone says that with three locks the facilities of the Panama Canal will be sufficient for 70 years to come. I join with the others who are asking and demanding without response why should this legislation be rushed in at the eleventh hour, and why should we be asked to authorize a survey of the Nicaraguan canal, when the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, a man who has been the chief engineer there for four years, says that the Panama Canal can take care of all requirements for 30 years and with an additional lock for 30 more years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Who is that signed by?

Mr. FISH. It is signed by Burgess, who is the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, and who was formerly chief engineer for years on the Panama Canal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The question is on the committee substitute for the Senate resolution.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the committee will now rise.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 117, pursuant to House Resolution 345, and he reported the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recom-

mendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the resolution as amended be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN moves to recommit S. J. Res. 117 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions to report the same back with the following amendment:

Strike out all of section 2, and "for the operation of a canal across Nicaragua or elsewhere and," on lines 5 and 6 of page 6.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BURTNESS. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. As many as favor ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-seven Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—ayes 56, noes 185.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the resolution pass?

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Connecticut yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I understand that we are about to take a recess until 8 o'clock. What business will be taken up at the night session?

Mr. TILSON. Conference reports and other privileged matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think the House ought to be informed that I shall endeavor to call up the conference report upon H. R. 349, the naturalization bill.

Mr. BEEDY. Do I understand that bridge bills are going to be brought up this evening?

The SPEAKER. The session to-night will be a regular business session of the House.

RECESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the House of Representatives is respectfully requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5715) entitled "An act for the relief of J. H. B. Wilder."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 16436. An act to provide for the repatriation of certain insane American citizens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9285. An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States on account of property damage, personal injury, or death.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 6496. An act granting the consent of Congress to compact or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Oklahoma with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Cimarron River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 6497. An act granting the consent of Congress to compact or agreements between the States of New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian or Red

Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 6499. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Arizona with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Gila and San Francisco Rivers and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 7024. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, San Juan, and Las Animas Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested; and

H. R. 7025. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, Oklahoma, and Kansas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested.

The message also announced that the House of Representatives is respectfully requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2127) entitled "An act for the relief of William S. Welch, trustee of the estate of the Joliet Forge Co., Joliet, Ill., bankrupt."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) entitled "Joint resolution authorizing an investigation and survey for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and the approximate cost of constructing and maintaining additional locks and other facilities at the Panama Canal, and for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and probable cost of constructing and maintaining an interoceanic ship canal across the Republic of Nicaragua.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1625. An act to carry into effect the findings of the court of claims in favor of Myron C. Bond, Guy M. Caffen, and Edwin A. Wells;

H. R. 2137. An act for the relief of Ed. Snyder, William Paddock, Ed. Strike, and A. S. Heydeck;

H. R. 2659. An act for the relief of Annie M. Lizenby;

H. R. 3044. An act for the relief of Leon Freidman;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of William F. Goode;

H. R. 3677. An act for the relief of F. M. Gray, Jr., Co.;

H. R. 3722. An act for the relief of Robert C. Osborne;

H. R. 4029. An act for the relief of Maude A. Sanger;

H. R. 4215. An act for the relief of Frank L. Merrifield;

H. R. 4264. An act for the relief of Philip V. Sullivan;

H. R. 4440. An act for the relief of Frederick O. Goldsmith;

H. R. 4611. An act for the relief of Marion M. Clark;

H. R. 4626. An act for the relief of Maj. Arthur A. Padmore;

H. R. 5264. An act for the relief of James P. Cornes;

H. R. 5338. An act for the relief of Roland M. Baker;

H. R. 5341. An act for the relief of Staunton Brick Co.;

H. R. 5399. An act for the relief of George Heitkamp;

H. R. 6496. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Oklahoma with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Cimarron River, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 6497. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian or Red Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 6499. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of New Mexico and Arizona with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Gila and San Francisco Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 7024. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Rio Grande, San Juan, and Las Animas Rivers, and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 7025. An act granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between the States of Colorado, Oklahoma, and Kansas with respect to the division and apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River and all other streams in which such States are jointly interested;

H. R. 7173. An act granting compensation to the daughters of James P. Gallivan;

H. R. 7230. An act for the relief of Charles L. Dewey;

H. R. 7244. An act for the relief of Mary Martin Harrison;

H. R. 7330. An act for the relief of E. M. Gillett and J. H. Swenarton;

H. R. 7552. An act for the relief of Bertina Sand;

H. R. 7930. An act to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve";

H. R. 7976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Moore L. Henry;

H. R. 8223. An act to authorize the sale of certain buildings at United States Veterans' Hospital No. 42, Perry Point, Md.;

H. R. 8423. An act for the relief of Timothy Hanlon;

H. R. 8598. An act for the relief of James J. Dowey;

H. R. 8886. An act for the relief of Luc Mathias;

H. R. 8987. An act for the relief of John R. Butler;

H. R. 9530. An act for the relief of W. L. Inabnit;

H. R. 9546. An act for the relief of T. D. Randall & Co.;

H. R. 9862. An act for the relief of M. T. Nilan;

H. R. 9972. An act for the relief of Charles Silverman;

H. R. 10045. An act for the relief of Robert S. Ament;

H. R. 10178. An act for the relief of the H. J. Heinz Co., Atlantic City, N. J.;

H. R. 10417. An act for the relief of George Simpson and R. C. Dunbar;

H. R. 10508. An act for the relief of T. P. Byram;

H. R. 11153. An act for the relief of Harry C. Tasker;

H. R. 11260. An act for the relief of Frans Jan Wouters, of Antwerp, Belgium;

H. R. 11500. An act for the relief of Ella Mae Rinks.

H. R. 11508. An act for the relief of Kirby Hoon;

H. R. 11698. An act conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the owner of the steamship *W. I. Radcliffe* against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12189. An act for the relief of Marie Rose Jean Baptiste, Marius Francois, and Regina Lexima, all natives of Haiti;

H. R. 12198. An act to authorize the exchange of timber with the Saginaw & Manistee Lumber Co.;

H. R. 12359. An act for the relief of the widow of Edwin D. Morgan;

H. R. 12548. An act for the relief of Margaret Vaughn;

H. R. 12650. An act for the relief of John F. Fleming;

H. R. 12867. An act granting an honorable discharge to Pierce Dale Jackson;

H. R. 13132. An act for the relief of J. D. Baldwin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13258. An act for the relief of H. L. Redlingshafer for payments made in official capacity disallowed by the General Accounting Office;

H. R. 13260. An act for the relief of Josiah Harden;

H. R. 13430. An act for the relief of Arthur E. Rump;

H. R. 13521. An act for the relief of Minnie A. Travers;

H. R. 13573. An act for the relief of Pedro P. Alvarez;

H. R. 13593. An act to legalize a bridge across the Fox River at East Dundee, Ill.;

H. R. 13869. An act for the relief of John Wesley Clark;

H. R. 13888. An act for the relief of Charles McCoombe;

H. R. 13992. An act for the relief of N. P. Nelson & Co.;

H. R. 14242. An act for the relief of Everett A. Dougherty;

H. R. 14663. An act directing that copies of certain patent specifications and drawings be supplied to the public library of the city of Los Angeles at the regular annual rate;

H. R. 14823. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

H. R. 14850. An act for the relief of Leo Byrne;

H. R. 14873. An act for the relief of Chesley P. Key;

H. R. 14897. An act for the relief of Matthias R. Munson;

H. R. 14975. An act for the relief of Capt. William Cassidy;

H. R. 15220. An act for the relief of Francis X. Callahan;

H. R. 15292. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Porter, Okla.;

H. R. 15293. An act for the relief of Lieut. John J. Powers, Quartermaster Corps;

H. R. 15421. An act for the relief of D. B. Heiner;

H. R. 15570. An act authorizing S. R. Cox, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.;

H. R. 15717. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Stanton, N. Dak.;

H. R. 15718. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of the county of Lake, State of Indiana, to re-

construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Grand Calumet River at or near Lake Street, in the city of Gary, county of Lake, Ind.;

H. R. 15723. An act authorizing an appropriation of Crow tribal funds for payment of council and delegate expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 15916. An act to provide for the construction of a new bridge across the South Branch of the Mississippi River from Sixteenth Street, Moline, Ill., to the east end of the island occupied by the Rock Island Arsenal;

H. R. 16126. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of the county of Lake, State of Indiana, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Grand Calumet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Cline Avenue, in the cities of East Chicago and Gary, county of Lake, Ind.;

H. R. 16131. An act to enable the Postmaster General to make contracts for the transportation of mails by air from possessions or Territories of the United States to foreign countries and to the United States and between such possessions or Territories, and to authorize him to make contracts with private individuals and corporations for the conveyance of mails by air in foreign countries;

H. R. 16169. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to accept title to a certain tract of land adjacent to the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal at East Chicago, Ind.;

H. R. 16170. An act authorizing Walter J. Mitchell, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Patuxent River, south of Burch, Calvert County, Md.;

H. R. 16205. An act authorizing the Fayette City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Fayette City, Fayette County, Pa.;

H. R. 16345. An act authorizing Frank A. Augsbury, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Morristown, N. Y.;

H. R. 16382. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

H. R. 16383. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the South Fork of the Cumberland River at or near Burnside, Pulaski County, Ky.;

H. R. 16384. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Burkesville, Cumberland County, Ky.;

H. R. 16385. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Canton, Ky.;

H. R. 16386. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Smthland, Ky.;

H. R. 16387. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Inka, Ky.;

H. R. 16388. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Eggners Ferry, Ky.;

H. R. 16389. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River;

H. R. 16393. An act to include henceforth, under the designation "storekeeper-gaugers," all positions which have heretofore been designated as those of storekeepers, gaugers, and storekeeper-gaugers; to make storekeeper-gaugers full-time employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16406. An act to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Annie E. Springer;

H. R. 16407. An act to repeal the provision of law granting a pension to Lottie A. Bowhall;

H. R. 16423. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Sabine at or near Port Arthur, Tex.;

H. R. 16425. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R. 16426. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Nebraska City, Nebr.;

H. R. 16427. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near the mouth of Indian Creek in Russell County, Ky.;

H. R. 16430. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Kanawha River at a point in or near the town of Henderson, W. Va., to a point opposite thereto in or near the city of Point Pleasant, W. Va.;

H. R. 16431. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge to be built across the Kanawha River at or near Henderson, W. Va., to a point opposite thereto at or near Point Pleasant, W. Va.;

H. R. 16432. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the County of Etowah, State of Alabama, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry;

H. R. 16433. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.;

H. R. 16436. An act to provide for the repatriation of certain insane American citizens;

H. R. 16448. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Clearwater, Minn.;

H. R. 16499. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near St. Albans, Kanawha County, W. Va.;

H. R. 16531. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Golconda, Ill.;

H. R. 16533. An act to authorize the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, to erect a memorial chapel at the naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.;

H. R. 16603. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Arat, Cumberland County, Ky.;

H. R. 16604. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Center Point, in Monroe County, Ky.;

H. R. 16605. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Creelsboro, in Russell County, Ky.;

H. R. 16606. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Neelys Ferry, in Cumberland County, Ky.;

H. R. 16609. An act extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.;

H. R. 16610. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Randolph County, Ill.;

H. R. 16640. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mound City, Ill.;

H. R. 16641. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Washington, Mo.;

H. R. 16645. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Helena, Ark.;

H. R. 16659. An act to authorize an appropriation to pay one-half the cost of a bridge on the Cheyenne River in the State of South Dakota;

H. R. 16660. An act to authorize an appropriation to pay one-half the cost of a bridge on the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation in South Dakota;

H. R. 16701. An act to provide for the payment of rental to the Board of Commissioners for the Port of New Orleans of the property known as the New Orleans Army Supply Base, New Orleans, La.;

H. R. 16714. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes;

H. R. 16719. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Chattanooga and the county of Hamilton, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River, at or near Chattanooga, Hamilton County, Tenn.;

H. R. 16725. An act authorizing L. L. Thompson, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Red River at or near Montgomery, La.;

H. R. 16791. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near Point Marion, Pa.;

H. R. 16818. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.;

H. R. 16824. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.;

H. R. 16867. An act for the relief of H. E. Jones;

H. R. 16985. An act authorizing the Uintah, Uncompahgre, and the White River Bands of the Ute Indians in Utah and Colorado and the Southern Ute and the Ute Mountain Bands of Ute Indians in Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico to sue in the Court of Claims;

H. R. 16988. An act to legalize the sewer outlet in the Allegheny River at Thirty-second Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.;

H. R. 17001. An act for the relief of Capt. Walter R. Gherardi, United States Navy;

H. R. 17020. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y.;

H. R. 17023. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near East Alburg, Vt.;

H. R. 17079. An act to repeal the provision in the act of April 30, 1908, and other legislation limiting the annual per capita cost in Indian schools;

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the District of Columbia of a monument or memorial to Oscar S. Straus;

H. J. Res. 399. Joint resolution providing more economical and improved methods for the publication and distribution of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the District of Columbia and supplements; and

H. J. Res. 431. Joint resolution providing for an investigation of Grover M. Moscovitz, United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1781. An act to establish load lines for American vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 2366. An act to amend subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to degree-conferring institutions;

S. 2410. An act to amend section 1440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 2901. An act to amend the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented;

S. 3736. An act for the relief of soldiers who were discharged from the Army during the World War because of misrepresentation of age;

S. 4039. An act to exempt joint-stock land banks from the provisions of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended;

S. 5544. An act to increase the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

S. 5706. An act authorizing Frank A. Augsburg, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Morristown, N. Y.;

S. 5847. An act authorizing Maynard D. Smith, his heirs, successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.;

S. 5746. An act to legalize the sewer outlet in the Allegheny River at Thirty-second Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.;

S. 5889. An act to provide for the preservation and consolidation of certain timber stands along the western boundary of the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution authorizing an investigation and survey for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and the approximate cost of constructing and maintaining additional locks and other facilities at the Panama Canal, and for the purpose of ascertaining the practicability and probable cost of constructing and maintaining an interoceanic ship canal across the Republic of Nicaragua.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, ILL.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill S. 5824, an identical bill being on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5824) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River at or near Ashland Avenue, in Cook County, State of Illinois

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Ashland Avenue in said

county and State, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois where is that bridge? Is it on Michigan Avenue?

Mr. DENISON. It is on Ashland Avenue.

Mr. SABATH. That is outside of my district. I thought it was in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. DENISON a similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I also call up the Senate bill 5835.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5835) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near St. Charles, Mo.

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the St. Louis-Kansas City Short Line Railroad Co., a corporation of the State of Missouri, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at a point about four miles south of west of the city of St. Charles, in the county of St. Charles, Mo., to a point in St. Louis County in said State, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT MIAMI, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate bill 5837, on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5837) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Saline County, Mo., authorized to be built by Frank M. Burruss, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by an act of Congress approved February 28, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from February 28, 1929.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT ARROW ROCK, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I also call up Senate bill 5836, an identical House bill being on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5836) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Saline County, Mo., authorized to be built by F. C. Barnhill, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by an act of Congress approved February 28, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from February 28, 1929.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT ARKANSAS CITY, ARK.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I also call up the bill S. 5825, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5825) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Arkansas City, Ark.

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Arkansas City, Ark., authorized to be built by Henry Thane, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by the act of Congress approved March 29, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from March 29, 1929.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT BETTENDORF, IOWA

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill S. 5844, an identical bill being on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5844) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Tenth Street in Bettendorf, State of Iowa

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Tenth Street in Bettendorf, State of Iowa, authorized to be built by B. F. Peek, G. A. Shallberg, and C. I. Josephson, of Moline, Ill.; J. W. Bettendorf, A. J. Russell, and J. L. Hecht, of Bettendorf and Davenport, Iowa, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by the act of Congress approved May 26, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from May 26, 1929.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER AT KANSAS CITY, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 5758. I am authorized by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to call it up.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5758) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans., authorized to be built by the Interstate Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, by act of Congress approved May 22, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from May 22, 1929.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

RAILROAD BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 5845, granting the consent of Congress to the Kentucky & Ohio Terminal Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Ohio River near Cincinnati, Ohio, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Kentucky & Ohio Terminal Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, above Cincinnati, Ohio, near Coney Island, to a point above Newport, Ky., opposite the Ohio terminal, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Kentucky & Ohio Terminal Co., its successors and assigns; and any party to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage or foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such party.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER NEAR ARROW ROCK, MO.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 5834, authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Arrow Rock, Mo., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the St. Louis-Kansas City Short Line Railroad Co., a corporation of the State of Missouri, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the town of Arrow Rock, in the State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS LAKE CHAMPLAIN

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 5045, authorizing Jed P. Ladd, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Lake Champlain from East Alburg, Vt., to West Swanton, Vt., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, Jed P. Ladd, of Burlington, Vt., his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, be, and he is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Lake Champlain, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between a point at or near East Alburg, Vt., and a point at or near West Swanton, Vt., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Jed P. Ladd, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the pro-

ceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said Jed P. Ladd, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Vermont, any public agency or political subdivision of such State within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches and any interest in real property necessary therefor, by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation, in accordance with the laws of such State governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of five years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall at any time be taken over or acquired by the State or public agencies or political subdivision thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. Jed P. Ladd, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Department of the State of Vermont a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of the highway department of such State shall, at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of cost so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge. For the purpose of such investigation the said Jed P. Ladd, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall make available all of his records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 4 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to Jed P. Ladd, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns; and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or persons.

SEC. 8. All contracts made in connection with the construction of the bridge authorized by this act and which shall involve the expenditure of more than \$5,000 shall be let by competitive bidding. Such contracts shall be advertised for a reasonable time in some newspaper of general circulation published in the States in which the bridge is located and in the vicinity thereof; sealed bids shall be required and the contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. Verified copies or abstracts of all bids received and of the bid or bids accepted shall be promptly furnished to the highway departments of the States in which such bridge is located. A failure to comply in good faith with the provisions of this section shall render null and void any contract made

in violation thereof, and the Secretary of War may, after hearings, order the suspension of all work upon such bridge until the provisions of this section shall have been fully complied with.

SEC. 9. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PERDIDO BAY, FLA.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 5677, to amend section 2 of the act, chapter 254, approved March 2, 1927, entitled "An act authorizing the county of Escambia, Fla., and/or the county of Baldwin, Ala., and/or the State of Florida, and/or the State of Alabama to acquire all the rights and privileges granted to the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co. by chapter 168, approved June 22, 1916, for the construction of a bridge across Perdido Bay from Lillian, Ala., to Cummings Point, Fla., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act, chapter 254, approved March 2, 1927, entitled "An act authorizing the county of Escambia, Fla., and/or the county of Baldwin, Ala., and/or the State of Florida, and/or the State of Alabama to acquire all the rights and privileges granted to the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co. by chapter 168, approved June 22, 1916, for the construction of a bridge across Perdido Bay from Lillian, Ala., to Cummings Point, Fla.," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. If the rights and privileges granted by said act approved June 22, 1916, shall be acquired by any one or more of the counties or States designated in section 1 of this act, it or they are authorized to transfer and assign all such rights and privileges to either or both of the counties or either or both of the States mentioned in said section 1, or to the highway commissioners or departments or other public agency of either or both of said States, but any bridge constructed or reconstructed under authority of said act of June 22, 1916, shall be maintained and operated in accordance with all the terms, provisions, and conditions of said act."

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to know whether any gentleman wishes to present conference reports at this time which are uncontested?

T. L. YOUNG AND C. T. COLE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill S. 4848, for the relief of T. L. Young and C. T. Cole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents a conference report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4848) entitled "An act for the relief of T. L. Young and C. T. Cole" having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out all the language in said bill after the numerals "1924," in line 1, page 2, except the period at the end thereof; and the House agree to the same.

ED. M. IRWIN,
U. S. GUYER,

Managers on the part of the House.

ARTHUR CAFFER,
GERALD P. NYE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 4848) for the relief of T. L. Young and C. T. Cole submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the Senate bill (S. 4848) provided that the defendants, T. L. Young and C. T. Cole, pay the costs in case No. 2613, and in the Senate amendment to the House amendment the claimants, T. L. Young and C. T. Cole, are relieved from liability.

ED. M. IRWIN,
U. S. GUYER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce an appointment. Under authority of section 175 of title 40 of the United States Code the Speaker appoints to succeed the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], upon the expiration of his term on March 4, 1929, the Hon. JOHN N. GARNER, of Texas. [Applause.]

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON ACCOUNT OF PROPERTY DAMAGE, PERSONAL INJURY, OR DEATH

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 9285, to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States on account of property damage, personal injury, or death, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 9285, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. UNDERHILL, IRWIN, and BULWINKLE.

ENTRY OF ALIENS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (S. 5094), making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law, for printing under the rule.

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask whether during the last three days it is necessary that a conference report be printed.

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then it can be called up when opportunity affords?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 17223, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, and June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 17223, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17223) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, and June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 33, 36, 37, 43, 44, 56, 69, 70, and 92.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 93, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 10 and 11 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "by contract or otherwise as the President" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in the discretion of the President, by contract or otherwise as he"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

"Salaries: For an additional amount for personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, fiscal years 1929 and 1930, \$161,000.

"Traveling expenses: For an additional amount for traveling expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1929, fiscal years 1929 and 1930, \$34,500.

"Contingent expenses: For an additional amount for contingent expenses, including the same objects specified under this head in the independent offices appropriation act for the fiscal year 1929, fiscal years 1929 and 1930, \$4,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Provided, That in the expenditure of any appropriations made under such public resolution, the commission is authorized to delegate to a board of alternates, designated by the commission for that purpose, any of the powers and duties vested in the commission by such public resolution, and the acts of such board of alternates shall have the same force and effect as though performed by the commission. The commission or the board of alternates may authorize the disbursement of funds, approved for disbursement by either of them, directly through a disbursing agent appointed or designated by the commission for that purpose, or may authorize such disbursing agent to advance funds to the insular treasury for effecting approved disbursements"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "Congress)," where it appears in such amendment, insert the following: "fiscal years 1929 and 1930," and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum "\$12,000,000," in said amendment, insert the following: "\$7,400,000, to be allocated in equal amounts to each vessel and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"BUREAU OF PROHIBITION

"Narcotic enforcement: For an additional amount for the enforcement of the acts relating to narcotics, including the same objects specified under this head in the act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1930, \$200,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line

3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "\$185,000" and insert "\$150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the article "a," insert the following: "laboratory and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the period and insert the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation in any community unless the State, county, or municipality in which the community is located agrees to pay one-half the expenses of such demonstration work"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of lines 14 and 15 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the syllable "ary" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "25, 1929"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS"

"Interoceanic canals: For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the investigation and survey to determine the practicability and cost of enlarging the Panama Canal to the extent which may be necessary to meet the future needs of shipping, and the practicability, necessity, and cost of an interoceanic ship canal over Nicaraguan territory, \$150,000, to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SHORT TITLE"

"This act may be cited as the 'second deficiency act, fiscal year 1929.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILL R. WOOD,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
HENRY W. KEYES,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
CARTER GLASS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17223) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, and June 30, 1930, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 1, 2, and 3, relating to the Senate: Appropriates \$1,800 for payment to two persons for services rendered the Senate or committees thereof, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 4 and 5, relating to the House of Representatives: Appropriates \$422.33, as proposed by the Senate, for payment to Everett Kent for expenses in connection with the contested-election case of James M. Beck.

On No. 6: Appropriates \$5,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding, Library of Congress.

On No. 7: Appropriates \$48,000 for improvements and maintenance at Mount Weather, Va., as proposed by the Senate, modified by placing the expenditure at the discretion of the President.

On No. 8: Eliminates the appropriation of \$250,000 proposed by the House primarily for an inquiry into the problem of law enforcement, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the ap-

priations proposed by the House under the Civil Service Commission of \$161,000 for salaries, \$34,500 for traveling expenses, and \$4,500 for contingent expenses.

On No. 9: Appropriates \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, for cooperative vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia.

On No. 10: Appropriates \$100,000 and authorizes contractual obligations to the extent of \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate, in consequence of the act creating the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission.

On No. 11: Modifies the proviso inserted by the Senate with respect to disbursement of funds appropriated for the relief of Porto Ricans by providing for a board of alternates to act in the place of the commission when designated by the commission for that purpose and authorizes the use of the insular treasury for making disbursements of appropriations when approved by the commission or the alternates.

On Nos. 12 and 13, relating to the District of Columbia: Appropriates \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate, on account of vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia, and strikes out the appropriation of \$1,000, proposed by the Senate, on account of additional accommodations for the Home for Aged and Infirm.

On Nos. 14 to 19, both inclusive, relating to the Department of Agriculture: Transfers \$10,000 of the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, 1930," to the Coast Guard appropriation "for compensation of civilian employees in the field, and so forth," 1930, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$25,000 for improvements at the dry land field station, Tucumcari, N. M., as proposed by the Senate; appropriates for fertilizer investigations \$17,000 for the fiscal year 1929 and \$25,000 for the fiscal year 1930, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$80,000 for carrying into effect the provisions of the migratory bird conservation act, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, \$6,000,000 for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood-stricken areas of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama; appropriates \$25,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the expense of an exhibit at the World's Fourth Poultry Congress.

On Nos. 20 to 24, both inclusive, relating to the Department of Commerce: Appropriates \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for enforcement of wireless communication laws; corrects the text of the appropriation proposed by the House for testing structural materials; appropriates \$190,000 for aids to navigation, Bureau of Lighthouses, and appropriates for mining experiment stations under the Bureau of Mines for the recovery of potash from domestic deposits \$33,000 for the fiscal year 1929 and \$25,000 for the fiscal year 1930, all as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 25 to 35, both inclusive, relating to the Interior Department: Appropriates \$1,067.35 for the payment of damage claims, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$67.35, as proposed by the House; authorizes and directs the Federal Power Commission to waive payment of the usual administrative fees or commissions in the issuance of permits or licenses for the development of power or power sites in the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont., as proposed by the Senate; authorizes the use of \$2,000 of the tribal funds of the Wichita and affiliated bands of Indians of Oklahoma for the payment of expenses of attorneys for such Indians in prosecuting claims pending in the Court of Claims, as proposed by the Senate; inserts a title for the appropriation for Lake Andes, S. Dak., spillway and drainage ditch, as proposed by the Senate; makes the appropriation for per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, Wisconsin, available for the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, as proposed by the Senate, instead of for the fiscal year 1929 only, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$91,000 on account of additional hospital facilities at the Kiowa Indian Hospital, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$100,000 of tribal funds for payment to the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma instead of \$200,000, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision proposed by the House denying the use of available funds for the enlargement of the Avalon Reservoir until the Director of the Geological Survey shall have reported favorably on the foundation of the Avalon Dam and on the depth to which water may be stored in the proposed enlarged reservoir; inserts a title to the authorization making 1930 appropriations for the Yellowstone National Park available for expenses incident to the adjustment of the boundaries of such park, as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes, as proposed by the Senate, the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the surplus elk from the Yellowstone National Park herd.

On Nos. 36 and 37, relating to the Department of Justice: Restores the appropriation of \$121,600, proposed by the House, on account of special assistant attorneys, and restores the ap-

appropriation of \$28,800, proposed by the House, for miscellaneous expenses of United States courts and their officers.

On Nos. 38 to 45, both inclusive, relating to the Navy Department: Appropriates \$16,484.78, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$14,228.78, as proposed by the House, for claims for damages by naval vessels; appropriates \$4,253.50, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,995, as proposed by the House, for damage claims, private property; makes \$10.61 of the Navy pension fund available for payment of claim of Floyd A. Newell, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the appropriations of \$140,000 and \$110,000 under the Bureaus of Engineering and Construction and Repair, respectively, proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$7,400,000 for modernizing the U. S. S. *Pennsylvania* and *Arizona*, to be allocated in equal amounts to each vessel, instead of \$12,000,000 without restriction as to allocation, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 46 and 47: Appropriates \$27,475.03, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$26,477.27, as proposed by the House, for the payment of damage claims, Post Office Department.

On Nos. 48 to 52, both inclusive, relating to the Department of State: Appropriates \$4,500 for payment to widow of George M. Hanson, late American consul at Colon, Panama, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$875 for the payment to the Chinese Government as full indemnity for the death of Wang Erh-Ko, as proposed by the Senate; corrects the text of the appropriation proposed by the House for the waterways treaty, United States and Great Britain, International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain; appropriates \$300 for each of the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, as proposed by the Senate, to pay the annual contribution of the United States in the plans of the organization of the International Society for the Exploration of the Arctic Regions by Means of the Airship; and appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Inter-parliamentary Union during the fiscal year 1930.

On Nos. 53 to 64, both inclusive, relating to the Treasury Department: Appropriates \$200,000 for the enforcement of acts relating to narcotics, instead of \$1,719,654 proposed by the House for the enforcement of the narcotic and national prohibition acts, proposed by the Senate to be eliminated; appropriates \$1,201.82, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,016.82, as proposed by the House, to pay damage claims; restores the appropriation of \$707,860 proposed by the House for collecting the revenue from customs; appropriates \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate, on account of the Coast Guard Academy; appropriates \$130,500 for studies in rural sanitation, as proposed by the Senate, amended to require that Federal funds be matched by State or county funds in advance of expenditure; changes the phraseology of the appropriation for the Clovis (N. Mex.) post office, as proposed by the Senate; makes a technical construction in the appropriation for the La Fayette (Ind.) post office, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$50,000 on account of the Salisbury (N. C.) post office, as proposed by the Senate, amended by establishing the total estimated cost at \$150,000, instead of \$185,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$25,000 to reimburse the Economics Building Co., Washington, D. C., for expenditures made by it in the erection of the Economics Building, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate, on account of Nogales (Ariz.) International Street.

On Nos. 65 to 77, both inclusive, relating to the War Department: Appropriates \$1,834.87, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,824.62, as proposed by the House, for settlement of damage claims; appropriates \$1,103,000 for construction at military posts and makes available for various construction projects at Camp Devens, Mass., \$300,000 previously appropriated for the construction of a hospital at Camp Devens, Mass., as proposed by the Senate; makes \$347,536 of sums previously appropriated for technical construction for the Army Air Corps available for various construction projects at Army air fields, as authorized by the act of February 25, 1929, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$1,050,403, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,402,344, as proposed by the Senate, for ammunition-storage facilities, Army; strikes out the authorization proposed by the Senate for a modification of the plans for storing ammunition in Hawaii; makes a technical correction; continues the availability of the unexpended balance of the appropriation in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1928, on account of Fort Donelson National Military Park, as proposed by the Senate; makes a technical correction in the appropriation for the battlefields of Brices Cross Roads and Tupelo, Miss.; appropriates \$150,000 for survey of the Panama Canal and the Nicaraguan route, as proposed by the Senate, rephrased so as to include investigation of the cost and necessity of the Nicaraguan route as well as the practicability; modifies the river and harbor project at Bayboro Harbor, St.

Petersburg, Fla., as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the Bath Home, Bath, N. Y., leased to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

On Nos. 78 to 83, inclusive, relating to judgments, United States courts: Appropriates \$7,712.40 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,679.80, as proposed by the House, and appropriates \$756,758.60, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$47,659.82, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 84 to 87, inclusive, relating to judgments, Court of Claims: Appropriates \$3,697,611.75, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,509,891.58, as proposed by the House.

On No. 88: Appropriates \$115,896.71 for audited claims, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 89: Makes a technical correction.

On No. 90: Appropriates \$5,000 for payment to John F. and Mary L. White, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 91: Strikes out the matter proposed by the House with respect to the Personnel Classification Board.

On No. 92: Strikes out the matter inserted by the Senate with respect to the reclassification of Federal employees.

On No. 93: Strikes out Title III of the bill, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 94: Corrects the short title of the act.

WILL. R. WOOD,
LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the conference report. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course, we do not have the report before us and all we can get is from the reading of the statement. Is there any instance in which the conferees have put into this report or dealt with anything in this report that was not in dispute between the two bodies?

Mr. WOOD. There is not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think it is well for that statement to go in the RECORD. I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I wish to say to the House that the conferees having under consideration the first and second deficiency bills are in complete agreement, for which we are very thankful and I presume every Member of this House is very grateful.

The statement that has just been read to you is with reference to the second deficiency act.

There are no items in dispute in so far as the first deficiency bill is concerned. The first deficiency bill, under the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves, has to be presented first to the Senate, while on the other hand we are to present the conference report on the second deficiency bill first to the House.

There are three or four important items that attracted more or less attention while these measures were under consideration in the House. Foremost, I expect, was the prohibition item.

I am glad to inform you that we are in complete agreement with reference to this item and I am pleased that the conferees on behalf of the Senate receded and accepted the proposition proposed by the House. [Applause.]

This is divided, however, in the first and second deficiency bills. In the first deficiency bill we have placed all that we put in the second bill for prohibition enforcement amounting to one million and some odd hundred thousand dollars. The other items with reference to an increase for the Department of Justice, for the Customs Service, and for the civil service are in the second deficiency bill or the one that has just been reported. In all, we have appropriated for prohibition enforcement in round numbers \$2,750,000.

I wish to say in this connection that an item of \$200,000 was proposed in the Senate, and adopted, for the enforcement of the narcotic law. This was agreed to by the conferees on behalf of the House.

Thus you will see how we have divided the amount of money that was suggested by the estimates that came from the Treasury Department with reference to prohibition enforcement.

There is another item that I wish to call to your attention where we found ourselves absolutely unable to reach an agreement and that was with reference to the limitation that was put upon the second deficiency bill concerning the salaries of the civil service employees in the District of Columbia.

The conferees representing the Senate would not yield and would not recede in the opposition of the Senate to the limitation placed on the bill as it passed the House and went over to the Senate. The so-called Brookhart amendment that was substituted in the Senate on the second deficiency bill was absolutely impossible so far as the conferees on behalf of the House were concerned, and the Senate having knocked out the House proposition, we together knocked out the Senate proposition and the matter is just as it was before either the Senate or the House acted upon it; and while it is unfortunate that there has been no legislation at this session of the Congress curing the ills that are manifest in the civil-service salaries of the District, I believe we have done the best thing possible in rejecting not only the proposal of the Senate but perhaps in not agreeing to the proposal of the House, because this will eventuate, I trust, in a just and equitable salary law coming as a matter of legislation from the committee whose business it is to propose such a law.

I can not agree to the proposal in the Brookhart amendment. I do not believe there is anyone acquainted with the facts that can subscribe to it. I do not believe there is any Member of this House or of the Senate, knowing the facts as they exist and can be made plain to everyone who wishes to inform himself, who believes that this Congress ever intended that any employee of this Government should jump two or three grades at once, raising in many instances, if you please, their salaries as much as \$2,000 and some as high as \$2,500. More than 2,800 of the civil-service employees have been benefited in the higher grades, while those in the lower grades have been benefited but a trifle.

We all believed, as was stated here time and time again, when the so-called Welch bill was passed, that we were enacting it for the purpose of helping the members of the clerical forces who were illy paid and none of us believed and none of us ever intended that instead of helping them but a trifle that we should increase by one-third, in many instances, the salaries of those in the higher brackets.

So that I say in regard to those who have the ill-gotten gains—and I measure my words—that legislation should be had to reduce the status in which they have been placed to that the Congress intended they should occupy, and at the same time those may receive the benefit intended for them, and I hope this legislation may be had at the earliest opportunity.

This committee has been assailed, has been besieged by those who were recipients of the large salaries. We have been told that unless they are allowed to remain we will lose in various departments many scientific, learned, and highly paid gentlemen who will go out into other fields. It is a wonder that they did not lose many of them from heart failure when they became conscious that the increase was made under this interpretation. [Laughter.] We are now in the condition that we were before your committee attempted to do anything with reference to the salary list of the civil service.

These are the two most important items in the report. There is another item that many are interested in, and that is the reconstruction of the two vessels—*Virginia* and *Pennsylvania*. An authorization was had a short time ago for the reconditioning of these two vessels, carrying an authorized appropriation of \$14,800,000. No estimates came in. It appeared that it was the part of economy to the United States to recondition these vessels immediately. We have conditioned six heretofore, and in order that they might recondition them economically and not make too great a strain on the Treasury at one time we have appropriated one-half of the allocation.

In this case we have provided that the allocation should be equal between the two vessels in reconditioning. These are among the prime items of importance in this bill that will come over to-night.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. EDWARDS. The \$6,000,000 for the storm sufferers is included in the bill?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. You have not reached any agreement as to the increase in salaries—that is still in controversy?

Mr. WOOD. No; it is not, as far as we are concerned. The Senate knocked out the proposal made by the House, and the conferees rejected the proposal made by the Senate. So neither is in either bill.

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. How much is the amount for reconditioning the vessels?

Mr. WOOD. \$7,400,000.

Mr. DOUGLASS of Massachusetts. How soon is the reconditioning to begin?

Mr. WOOD. As soon as the vessels now on the ways are taken off; about the 1st of July next.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What became of my little item for Lucy Knox?

Mr. WOOD. That went the way of the whangdoodle. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman stated how much was in the bill for prohibition enforcement?

Mr. WOOD. You will see that the item carried in the joint bill provided for \$250,000 for the survey to be made. As proposed in the Senate it was to inquire into the violation of the prohibition laws and stopped at that. But in order that there might be a full and intelligent survey, made not only of the violation of the prohibition law but the violation of all laws, we enlarged the language so as to make it apply to the investigation of all law violations.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. The item in regard to the rural sanitation is in the bill?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, I take the floor to comment briefly on that portion of this conference report which has eliminated all prospect of any correction of the glaring defects and inequalities that the Congress about a year ago forced upon the Government employees. If any Member of the House thought that we were passing legislation that would benefit the poorer-paid employees when we passed the Welch bill, then he just deliberately and blindly shut his eyes and stopped up his ears, and did not carefully consider what he was voting on. The Welch bill as originally introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] was designed to aid the lower-paid employees, and it would have cost the Government around \$90,000,000 a year.

We all remember very well that great army of clerks and employees who came to Capitol Hill to evince their interest in this legislation, and many of us were enthusiastic because we hoped the time had come when we would be able to do something in a material way for this great army of underpaid clerks and employees of the Government. But what happened? The legislation was submitted not to the legislative branch of the Government, but to the executive branch of the Government, and the Director of the Budget started in to cut off some of the necessary funds to pay for this legislation. Of course, instead of cutting it off from the higher-paid employees, he cut it off from the lower-salaried employees, and we passed a legislative monstrosity, under which, after the Comptroller General had put the finishing touches on it, we found we had increased the salaries of a group of higher-paid Government officials anywhere from \$1,500 a year to \$2,500 a year, and the clerks receiving around \$1,100 or \$1,200 or \$1,500 were given \$120 a year increase, or sometimes only \$60 a year.

This Congress was importuned to pass corrective legislation, and the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, Mr. LEHLBACH, introduced a very splendid bill, known as the Lehlbach bill. In the first place, the Lehlbach bill undertook to call upon the Personnel Classification Board to reallocate those higher-paid salaries, and to take the money out of the pockets of those officials who had appropriated the fund illegally, and unlawfully to their own salaries, and reallocate it and give the lower-paid employees an increase. That was a righteous provision, and the House incorporated that provision in the deficiency appropriation bill when we passed it the other day. In the next place, the gentleman from New Jersey incorporated in his bill certain provisions which would have insured additional raises in salaries of the lower-paid employees.

But again the executive branch of the Government stepped in and showed its hand, and the gentleman from New Jersey reintroduced his bill, and when the new bill was reintroduced he cut out all reference to a reduction of the higher-paid employees, and the ultimatum came down to this end of Pennsylvania Avenue from other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that there would be no pay legislation if Congress undertook to reduce the salaries of any of the higher-paid employees, and the House of Representatives, doing in this instance just as it has done in the instance of the retirement legislation, hauled down its flag and abdicated in favor of the executive branch of the Government. And there will be no legislation this Congress in the interest of the lower-paid Federal employees.

What has happened in this bill? In the deficiency appropriation bill the House has incorporated a provision demanding that these higher-paid employees disgorge, that they give up these salaries that they have unlawfully appropriated to themselves and that this money be parcelled out to the lower-paid employees. The Senate at the other end of the Capitol incorporated a provision that would have given a raise to the lower-paid employees.

I do not criticize our conferees. I am sure that they had a tremendous task to perform, and there were many important and necessary items in this bill that could not be prejudiced. However, the conferees on the part of the Senate and House got into a room and had a boxing match, and the House kicked out the Senate provisions and the Senate kicked out the House provision, and now we come down to the end, and the gavel will fall on the 4th of March with the same confusion and chaos in the ranks of the Government employees that existed a year ago, and it will keep on doing that until the House of Representatives stops long enough in the earlier days of one of its sessions to give sane, careful consideration to this great problem. And what must we do? We must have a complete survey of the whole Federal pay roll and take the time to sit down and work it out, and stop legislating for groups and classes.

We raise this group and the next group comes in for a raise, and then another group comes in for a raise. Some of you may be astounded when I tell you to-night that there is not a Federal department now that can tell you within 10,000 or 15,000 or 20,000 how many employees there are of this Federal Government. There is not a department that knows that. Everybody has guessed about it and Congress has been guessing about it.

I know it is too late in the session to pass any kind of constructive legislation on this point. My only thought in taking your time to-night when you are busy and want to get to other affairs is to register a protest in order that when we come back again in another legislative session we may give to this matter of readjusting Federal salaries careful consideration, and take time and have patience and try to mete out some measure of justice to the men and women in the departments who are working on small salaries, and, if you please, who are the warp and woof of this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I asked the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in charge of the bill [Mr. WOOD], what had become of the little item for Mrs. Lucy B. Knox. He said it had gone the way of the whangdoodle. I do not know what a whangdoodle is, but I want to take the time to protest against the fact that this item was not included in either the first nor second deficiency bill by the House Appropriations Committee.

It is a matter which I think should be considered at this time. Mrs. Lucy B. Knox is the widow of Lieut. Commander Forney Moore Knox, who died in the interim between the time the law was supposed to be repealed by the war risk insurance act and its reenactment June 4, 1920. If Commander Knox had lived four months longer his widow would have received at once a half year's salary of \$2,370.

I brought the matter before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Sixty-ninth Congress. They reported the bill favorably. It was passed by this House. It went to the Senate, but was lost in committee. I went before the Committee on Naval Affairs again at the last session. It was reported favorably again, and passed this House April 20, 1928. It went over to the Senate and passed the Senate, and was signed by the President. An estimate was sent down to the Appropriations Committee at this session. And yet in spite of the fact that the bill had passed this House on two occasions and had passed the Senate and was signed by the President and an estimate had been sent down to the Committee on Appropriations the Committee on Appropriations of the House has absolutely ignored it. In the Senate they put it in the first deficiency bill, and they put it in the second deficiency bill, and yet the conference committee on this side opposed the Senate amendment, so it was omitted.

Now, the question I want to bring before you is just this: Has this House no voice in the appropriation of the people's money when such appropriation has been considered and authorized by Congress? Has the Appropriation Committee grown so great that it can so ignore legislation? Are we to sit idly by and have the Committee on Appropriations ignore us? Was it not their duty to appropriate?

I asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—the gentleman and I are perfectly good friends—why it was, and he said he did not know, but that he did not believe in it. I said to him, "The Senate and the House have both passed it." He said, "Yes; we have even to correct the actions of the House of Representatives on some occasions."

As I understand, it was tacitly understood that this Committee on Appropriations when created, as I understood and when I

voted for its establishment, would appropriate for the things we authorized to be paid. Yet the committee by its act says concerning this little widow (who is working for her living), while other widows of men who died in the naval service are receiving their money, that she can not get her half-year salary because her husband died before a certain day of the reenactment. I asked the chairman why not insert the appropriation? He replied, "Because it would set a dangerous precedent." I wrote to the chairman of the committee and also the conferees and quoted them four separate precedents on all-fours with this, and yet they refused.

I think this is a matter worthy of being called to the attention of the House, and I am going to insist that Mrs. Lucy B. Knox be given the money to which she is entitled. I have just begun to fight. [Applause.]

[Extract from Naval Affairs Committee report]

Commander Forney Moore Knox died during a lapse in the law; that is, between the time that it was held to have been repealed by the war risk insurance act and the time it was reenacted, June 4, 1920.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize payment to Lucy B. Knox of six months' pay at the rate received by her husband, the late Lieut. Commander Forney Moore Knox, United States Navy, at the time of his death. The records show that this officer died at Annapolis, Md., on February 16, 1920, as the result of pneumonia.

The act approved May 13, 1908, which was repealed by the act of October 6, 1917, provided for the payment to the beneficiary of an officer or enlisted man of the Navy or Marine Corps, who died as the result of wounds or disease contracted in the line of duty, of an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate received by the officer or enlisted man concerned at the date of his death. This provision of law was reenacted under the act of June 4, 1920, but at the time of Lieutenant Commander Knox's death, there was no law in effect which authorized the payment of the gratuity in question to his widow.

Had Lieutenant Commander Knox's death occurred on or after June 4, 1920, his widow would have been entitled to six months' pay at the rate received by her late husband at the time of his death. However, the date of this officer's death precludes payment of the gratuity to his widow under the law.

The Navy Department has consistently recommended general legislation, but the committee is of the opinion that these cases should be taken care of as they are presented by the individuals. In the Sixty-seventh Congress legislation was enacted granting six months' pay to the following persons: Harriet B. Castle, private law 273; Alice P. Dewey, private law 255; Josephine Barin, private law 242; Ellen McNamara, private law 222.

The Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1406) granting six months' pay to Lucy B. Knox, having had the same under consideration, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

When the war risk insurance act was passed it was held that the act granting six months' pay to the widow of an officer who died in the service was repealed. This seemingly was not the intent of the Congress as they again in the act of June 4, 1920, reenacted in substance the former law which gave to the widow six months' pay upon the death of her husband. That law is as follows:

"That hereafter, immediately upon official notification of the death from wounds or disease, not the result of his own or her own misconduct, of any officer, enlisted man, or nurse on the active list of the regular Navy or regular Marine Corps, or on the retired list when on active duty, the Paymaster General of the Navy shall cause to be paid to the widow, and if there be no widow to the child or children, and if there be no widow or child, to any other dependent relative of said officer, enlisted man, or nurse previously designated by him or her an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate received by such officer, enlisted man, or nurse at the date of his or her death. The Secretary of the Navy shall establish regulations requiring each officer and enlisted man or nurse having no wife or child to designate the proper dependent relative to whom this amount shall be paid in case of his or her death. Said amount shall be paid from funds appropriated for the "Pay of the Navy" and "Pay of the Marine Corps," respectively.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

MANKATO, KANS., February 25, 1929.

HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Believing that it might be convenient to the committee and to its chairman and to the Republican organization in the Congress, I hereby hand you my resignation, effective immediately, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the Seventieth Congress.

This letter is your authority to that effect.

Most respectfully yours,

HAYS B. WHITE,

Member of Congress, Sixth Kansas District.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ALFRED L. DIEBOLT, SR., AND ALBERT L. DIEBOLT, JR.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12475, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 12475, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill by title and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12475) for the relief of Alfred L. Diebolt, sr., and Alfred L. Diebolt, jr.

The Senate amendments were read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois inform us what is the aggregate amount appropriated by the Senate amendments?

Mr. IRWIN. They knock out about \$2,500 and add \$5,000.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that he is prepared to recognize, and recognize only for a short time, gentlemen who desire to take up House bills with Senate amendments and ask to concur in the Senate amendments.

EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10431, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10431) to amend section 101 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The Senate amendment was read.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

FEDERAL INDUSTRIAL INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN AT ALDERSON, W. VA.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 5493, relating to the construction of a chapel at the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va., now on the Speaker's table and which is the same as the House bill reported on favorably by the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 5493, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized to accept for and on behalf of the United States funds raised or to be raised by popular subscription for the construction of a suitable chapel upon the premises occupied and used by and for the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va. The funds so donated shall be expended under the direction of the Attorney General for the construction of such chapel and, after construction, the chapel shall be maintained at the expense of the United States: *Provided*, That the Attorney General is authorized to procure by contract preliminary sketches for the chapel, and after approval thereof by the Attorney General, to procure by contract working drawings, full-size details, specifications, etc., for the construction of the chapel and supervision of the construction: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, if requested of the Attorney General, to cause the plans, drawings, specifications, and estimates for the construction of the chapel to be prepared in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, and the work of constructing said chapel to be supervised by the field force of said office if practicable: *And provided further*, That the proper appropriation for the support and maintenance of the Office of the Supervising

Architect be reimbursed from said donated funds for the cost of preparing such plans, drawings, specifications, and estimates for the aforesaid work and the supervision of the construction of said chapel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, have all the names of the women's societies been stricken from this bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the action of the Senate and approved by our committee.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What check-up will there be?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know. This bill was amended in the Senate and was adopted by our committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REGISTRATION OF NURSES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 15387, to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," with Senate amendments, and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 15387, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

UNPLATTED PORTIONS OF GOVERNMENT TOWN SITES ON IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 16082, to authorize the disposition of unplatted portions of Government town sites on irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 16082, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we realize the press of business to-night, but when gentlemen on the other side ask unanimous consent to take up bills on the Speaker's table we think they should at least predicate their request by the statement that they have conferred with the Members on the minority side, or that the request is at the direction of the committee involved.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman is correct, and the Chair hopes hereafter chairmen of committees will announce, in calling up these House bills with Senate amendments and to concur in the Senate amendments, that they are authorized by their committees to do so. The Chair assumes that is the fact.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We trust that will not be a violent assumption to-night.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes so, too. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

J. A. SMITH

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Claims, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 14728, for the relief of J. A. Smith, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 14728, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

FEDERAL BUILDING SITE AT SAVANNAH, GA.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 17026, granting a part of the Federal building site at Savannah, Ga., to the city of

Savannah for street purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment. This is a bill which belongs to the minority side. I have conferred with them, and they are satisfied with it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 17026, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

COMMANDER FRANCIS JAMES CLEARY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10274) for the relief of Commander Francis James Cleary, United States Navy, and concur in the Senate amendment. I will state, Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with the other members of the committee, particularly the ranking members on the Democratic side of the committee, and they agree that this action should be taken.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND FORMER OFFICERS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the members of the War Claims Committee I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4265) for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States and for other individual claims approved by the War Department, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

ANNIE M'COLGAN

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of Annie McColgan, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

NATURALIZATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 349) to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Two hundred and eighty-seven Members present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Washington calls up the conference report, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 349) to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 1 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 11, strike out "July 1, 1924," and insert "July 3, 1921";

On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 4 and 5, strike out "After the expiration of 60 days after the enactment of this act no" and in lieu thereof insert "No";

On page 3 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 7, after "valid," insert a comma;

On page 5 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 2, before the period, insert a comma and the following: "in addition to the affidavits required by this act to be included in the petition";

On page 8 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 22, strike out "or under section 1993 of the Revised Statutes,";

On page 9 of the Senate engrossed amendment, lines 16 and 17, strike out "be conclusive evidence of the citizenship of the individual named therein" and insert "have the same effect as a certificate of citizenship issued by a court having naturalization jurisdiction";

One page 11 of the Senate engrossed amendment, line 4, after the semicolon, insert "any political subdivision of a State not included within any county" and a semicolon; and

On page 12 of the Senate engrossed amendment, after line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 12. Sections 1 to 10, inclusive, of this act shall take effect on July 1, 1929. The remainder of the act shall take effect upon its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ALBERT JOHNSON,

BIRD J. VINCENT,

Geo. J. SCHNEIDER,

Managers on the part of the House.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON,

DAVID A. REED,

ROYAL S. COPELAND,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 349) to supplement the naturalization laws, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill changes the method of making proof of residence and good moral character by petitioners for naturalization. The Senate amendment strikes out the House text and inserts a number of provisions relating to naturalization. These are:

(1) The provisions of the House bill are substantially reinserted with a few clerical amendments. To these clerical amendments the House agrees with further clerical amendments.

(2) It is provided, in the case of petitions heard after the enactment of the act, that the five years' continuous residence required for naturalization purposes shall be presumed to have been broken by return to the country of the alien's allegiance, and remaining there for more than six months but less than one year, such presumption to be overcome on showing of reasonable cause for not returning sooner. Absence for a continued period of one year or more conclusively breaks the continuity of residence. The House agrees to this provision.

(3) Another provision extends the privilege of naturalization of alien seamen serving three years on board merchant or fishing vessels of the United States of more than 20 tons burden, so as to include service on all vessels of more than 20 tons burden which are not foreign vessels, the principal classes thus included being yachts and certain harbor boats. The Senate amendment also adds a clarifying provision to the existing law relating to the naturalization of members of the military and naval forces and seamen. The House agrees to these provisions.

(4) The Senate amendment also authorizes the making, upon payment of a fee of \$20, of a record at ports of entry in the case of an alien in whose case there is no record of admission for permanent residence, if the alien shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner General of Immigration that he entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, has resided here continuously since the date of his entry, is a person of good moral character, and is not subject to deportation. The record thus made may be used as a basis for issuance of the certificate of arrival required by the naturalization laws to be attached to the petition for citizenship. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, an alien for whom a record of registry has been made is deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry. The House agrees to these provisions, with an amendment limiting their application to aliens who entered the United States prior to June 3, 1921.

(5) The Senate amendment also provides that declarations of intention made after 60 days after the passage of the act shall not be valid until a certificate of arrival has been issued

and the lawful entry of the alien for permanent residence has been established. The House agrees to this provision with an amendment making the effective date July 1, 1929.

(6) The House also agrees to the provisions of the Senate amendment establishing a fee of \$5 for all certificates of arrival, raising the fee for declarations of intention from \$1 to \$5, and the fee for certificates of citizenship from \$4 to \$10, and to a provision relating to the method of accounting for fees received by clerks of Federal courts in naturalization proceedings.

(7) The Senate amendment also provides for the issuance by the Commissioner of Naturalization of duplicate certificates of citizenship and declarations of intention where the original is lost, mutilated, or destroyed. A fee of \$10 is provided. The House agrees to this provision.

(8) The House also agrees to a Senate provision authorizing the Commissioner of Naturalization to issue, upon payment of a fee of \$10, to any naturalized citizen a special certificate of citizenship for use by the citizen only for the purpose of obtaining recognition as a United States citizen by the country of his former allegiance.

(9) The Senate amendment also authorizes the Commissioner of Naturalization to issue a certificate of citizenship to any individual over 21 years of age claiming to have derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or husband, or by birth in a foreign country of an American father, upon payment of a fee of \$10 and the taking of an oath of allegiance. The certificate can not be granted unless the individual is within the United States. The amendment further provides that the certificate of citizenship thus issued shall be conclusive evidence of citizenship, and provides for penalties for offenses in connection with the certificate and its issuance. The House agrees to these provisions with two amendments, first taking out the language which authorized the issuance of certificates to persons deriving citizenship by birth in a foreign country of an American father, and, secondly, providing that the certificate instead of being conclusive evidence, shall have the same effect as a certificate of citizenship issued by a court having naturalization jurisdiction.

(10) The House agrees to provisions of the Senate amendment requiring an applicant for first or final citizenship papers to furnish two photographs of himself for identification purposes, and directing the Commissioner of Naturalization to make studies and furnish statistical information that will show the relation by nationalities of aliens heretofore seeking citizenship to the numbers of annually arriving aliens and to the census of foreign-born populations.

The action of the House conferees as above indicated is subject to the further condition that the taking effect of the act shall be postponed to July 1, 1929, except the section of the Senate amendment authorizing appropriation of the sums necessary to carry out the act.

ALBERT JOHNSON,
BIRD J. VINCENT,
GEO. J. SCHNEIDER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House—

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. With pleasure.

Mr. BOX. What arrangement will the gentleman be able to make as to time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. My desire is to make a statement of about 10 minutes, roughly outlining the bill and then yield to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Illinois, members of the committee, between them about 25 minutes.

Mr. BOX. I thought the gentleman from Texas was to have 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think that is about right. I would like to make as brief a statement as I can as to the necessity for the major part of this legislation.

This has been a great problem in the naturalization office, the Department of Labor, and in Congress for many years. In the old days it was the so-called nunc pro tunc process. For years many efforts were made to put riders on bills to take care of a situation that seemed unhandleable.

If you will examine the naturalization law of June 29, 1906, made at a time when the Immigration Service was not a great bureau, you will find that the naturalization provision in the first paragraph provided that the Bureau of Naturalization, under the direction and control of the Secretary, shall have charge of all matters concerning naturalization of aliens, and that it shall be the duty of the Bureau of Immigration to do certain things. What? To provide for the use of the various

immigration stations throughout the United States books and records wherein the Commissioner of Immigration shall cause a registry to be made in the case of each alien arriving in the United States, personal description, and so forth, intended place of residence, and the date of arrival of said alien, and if entered through a port, the name of vessel in which he came; and it shall be the duty of said Commissioner of Immigration to cause to be granted to such alien a certificate of such registry with the particulars thereof.

In thousands and thousands of cases this was not done.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is that not now the law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That naturalization law is in effect.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Then, why bring out a new bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not bringing up a new one. I am explaining why this bill (H. R. 349) is necessary, for the reason that many persons who were entitled to receive certificates of entry from the United States Government never received them. That is the whole point.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For five years no record was made at the American points of entry along the Canadian border. Inspection of aliens was made at Montreal, Halifax, Vancouver, and other Canadian ports, but the law required a record to be made at the American ports of entry, such as Seattle, Buffalo, Detroit, Portal, N. Dak., and other places.

Probably the largest number of beneficiaries under the act we are now about to agree to will be due to this failure of recording. The parents and friends of many who came here are now dead. Children from other countries can not tell you how they came, because the United States did not keep a record, although the law I have read calls for that record.

That was, in part, the situation when the temporary quota law was passed limiting the number and making exceptions for visitors for pleasure. The quota law was passed June 3, 1921. This conference report calls for the use of that date on which the officers may on proper inquiry issue a certificate of entry to the alien domiciled prior to June 3, 1921, and who at the time of the application can show good conduct. With a certificate of entry, and then proceed to citizenship in the course of time, and must, of course, prove good conduct.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is referring to the people in this country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And we can not put them out on account of the statute of limitations?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I should have mentioned that.

Mr. CELLER. There is nothing in the act involving compulsory registration?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; nothing at all. Persons who have been here five years can not be deported except for a few crimes. The people to which this bill refers have been here since 1921 and can not be deported. Those that came between 1921 and July, 1924, are not included in this bill. There was great pressure to bring it down to that date, but the House conferees thought otherwise. Persons who have been here, coming prior to July 1, 1924, will not be deportable after the coming 4th of July.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Can they get citizenship papers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What proof does the applicant have to make?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It will be by affidavit and inquiry, just as now.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If there is no record of his entry, how can he prove it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He will have to prove his actual presence by affidavit.

Now, a further feature of this report is that many paid their head tax and some did not pay their head tax. Those who receive a certificate of entry will pay \$20. Many have already paid the head tax. It was smaller many years ago but is now \$8.

Another feature of the bill is as soon as this goes into effect the total fees of all naturalization will be \$20. The whole process for all, whether the record can not be shown to be true up to 21 or not—the whole fee is \$5. I think that is quite right. In Canada the naturalization fees are \$25. In England, \$40; in Switzerland more than \$25.

Now, the other features of the bill have to do with administration, making up the records of naturalization, which you will find highly valuable.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

Mr. BOX. A prominent American journal recently said of my work in this House and on this committee that I believe that "the way to restrict immigration is to restrict immigration." I accept that as a correct interpretation and a compliment. The only objection which the antirestrictionists have to this bill is that it does not go far enough in the direction in which they want to go. The objection which restrictionists have to this bill is that it is a long move in a direction backward from the restrictionist standpoint, seriously impairing the naturalization laws, making a serious breach in the immigration laws, and preparing the way for further backward movements on both these lines.

The main provisions of this bill have never been before this House. They consist of the Copeland amendment, added by the Senate to the harmless and helpful provisions of the Vincent bill (H. R. 349), correcting some minor weaknesses in naturalization procedure. The Schneider bill (H. R. 13793), reported by the House committee in the absence of the chairman by a divided vote, carried some of the provisions of this measure, but some of the safeguards which the objectionable Schneider bill carried were, of course, eliminated by the Copeland amendment, and some entirely new and bad things were embodied in the Copeland amendment not included in the Schneider bill (H. R. 13793).

The conferees are in this report handing the restrictionists of the House a "package" the like of which neither the House committee nor any conference committee have before called upon them to accept during my service in this House. While handing us this gas bomb the conferees and the other body have taken away the mask which our denatured deportation bill was designed to furnish. The history of our deportation bills will be interesting to restrictionists of this House and the country and will throw light upon the situation which presents such a proposition as this to the House and the country.

During the Sixty-ninth Congress your committee expended great labor on a deportation bill, which it reported to the House and which the House, upon mature consideration, passed by a large majority. That bill went to the Senate and was never passed.

During the first session of this, the Seventieth Congress, your committee reported a somewhat modified edition of the deportation bill, which had already passed this House during the former Congress, but that second edition remained asleep on the calendar. After the purpose to bring forth some such measure as this fully developed, the chairman hurriedly threw together some matter on deportation which the committee hastily considered and which the House hastily passed. That bill contained much that was good, but having received immature consideration was in some of its parts subject to just criticism. The bill was as a rider placed on a Senate bill and went to conference. But it is pretty safe to say that it has been or will be either emasculated or killed. What is left of it is too much out of line with this bill for both to survive. For instance, it provided that an alien who was smuggled into the country could be fined and imprisoned, while this bill proposes to give vast numbers of such people the privileges and responsibilities of American citizenship and allows them to bring in great numbers of nonquota relatives, which they can not now do.

Time will not permit me to discuss all of the bad things contained in this bill, but one of them is found in subdivisions (c), (d), and (e) of section 6, the last of which provides for the repeal of section 10 of the naturalization act of 1906, as amended, and section 2170 of the Revised Statutes. The latter section provides that—

No alien shall be admitted to become a citizen who has not for a continued term of five years next preceding his admission resided within the United States.

The law now permits an alien seaman employed in the Navy of the United States or on any vessel of United States registry or enrollment to become naturalized after a service of three years, without proof of any residence within the territorial limits of the United States. This law was probably enacted in an effort to Americanize aliens in the Navy and merchant marine of the country, but the privilege went to none but such as were employed on vessels of United States registry. That limitation is removed by this delightful measure, so that harbor boats and yachts have to keep their alien crews only three years before they can have them become American citizens. An alien on shore among the body of the people must stay five years. Under the former law an alien in the service of our Navy or merchant marine had that time shortened to three years.

Now it is proposed that the harbor boats and private yachts of more than 20 tons burden may fill their crews with aliens and

have them remain on these vessels, without contact with Americanizing influences, and yet become citizens within three years. There are several hundred rich Americans with yachts whose alien employees would come within this class. It is nice for them to hire cheap alien seamen in various capacities on their yachts, and it is very important that you restrictionists from the interior should hasten to give them that privilege.

Then there are considerable numbers of rum runners which are not enrolled or registered as American vessels. It will help their business if you will give their alien seamen citizenship quicker than you do an alien who is living among you.

Besides, there are a great many harbor boats in our larger seaports which are not enrolled or registered as American vessels. Some of them are said to be engaged in the business of smuggling aliens into the United States. Of course, it will help their business for you to give their alien seamen citizenship within three years, though I have no reason to believe that it will be better for the citizenship to have that done. But you will understand that all of the alien seamen who thus get American citizenship within three years will have the privilege of bringing certain relatives into the country as non-quota immigrants. If they have filed declaration of intention they will get citizenship and bring their nonquota relatives sooner. This, of course, is exactly in line with the whole tenor and purpose of the Copeland amendment to this bill. I shall discuss some other features of it in connection with the main body of the bill.

Under the long-established policy pursuant to which our naturalization laws have been written and maintained aliens who smuggle themselves into the country in violation of the immigration laws have been denied the right to become citizens, the privilege of reentering the country upon going out, and the favor accorded to citizens and aliens lawfully in the country of having certain near relatives admitted as immigrants, either by preference within the quota or as nonquota immigrants. The Copeland amendment to H. R. 349, as presented in this conference report, proposes to reverse that policy as to all aliens who came into the country illegally prior to June 3, 1921, and as to all who, entering prior to that date, have illegally remained in the country since then in violation of their obligation to depart upon expiration of the term of their temporary admission.

It proposes that many thousands of aliens who entered the United States prior to June 3, 1921, in contempt of law and those who have unlawfully remained while under obligation to depart shall have their illegal entry or stay validated by certificate of arrival upon making some showing in an ex parte proceeding before subordinates of the Immigration Service in the field that such alien—

- (1) Entered the United States prior to June 3, 1921;
- (2) Has resided continuously in the United States since such entry;
- (3) Is a person of good moral character; and
- (4) Is not subject to deportation.

There is no requirement that he shall have entered the country without any intent to violate the law; no restriction that the immigration officers shall find that he is such a person as should now be admitted under the law, or that he could have been admitted had he properly applied for admission as an immigrant. Both of these provisions were consciously and intentionally omitted because they would have barred the hundreds of thousands of guilty aliens and their relatives now in Europe, to whom this bill caters.

The House committee bill, reported by a divided vote, required that it be shown that such person has behaved as a person of good moral character at all times since entry, but that was changed in the Copeland amendment and in the conference report so as to merely show that he is of a good moral character now. Nearly anybody can make that statement in an ex parte affidavit if no questions are to be asked about his past.

The provision that such aliens shall not be subject to deportation has little restrictive effect because deportation proceedings against nearly all such are already barred by the statutes of limitations. The conference report contains no requirement that the alien shall show that he entered the United States legally; that he has rightfully remained within the United States; or that he was admissible under the law at the time of his entry, or that his illegal entry or stay was without intent to violate the law. The policy heretofore maintained in excluding him from citizenship and from other privileges recognizes the sound principle that wrongful intent is presumed from the alien's conscious action.

The chief purpose of the Copeland amendment and this conference report is not to provide a nunc pro tunc showing of lawful entry heretofore made. Its chief purpose is to pardon and reward the illegal entry of all who smuggled themselves into

the United States prior to June 3, 1921, and all who have illegally remained after the expiration of the period of their temporary visits.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I can not. I am very sorry.

Another class specifically designed to receive this pardon and reward consists of deserting seamen who entered prior to the date named under obligation to depart upon expiration of their shore leave. There are many thousands of these.

This bill will have a direct and substantial effect (1) in giving the ballot to hundreds of thousands not worthy of it and not equal to its responsibilities, and (2) in heavily increasing the volume of our immigration.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I can not yield.

To help you appreciate the situation with which you are dealing I call your attention to the fact that under our present law, unimpaired by such serious breaches as this will be, we are receiving at least three times as many aliens as the quota numbers. The present quota is about 164,000 per year, but it does not apply to all classes nor all countries, nor to temporary visitors. While we are telling the country that we have reduced the immigration quotas to 2 per cent, based on the census of 1890, and that the quotas are about 164,000 plus, we are in fact receiving of all classes about 500,000; but these large numbers do not include deserting seamen, aliens who smuggled themselves into the country, and others whom this bill will favor.

As indicating a part of this situation, I call your attention to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Labor Robe Carl White, given January 12, 1926, as reported in Immigration Committee hearings, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, page 172:

Mr. SABATH. What is the gentleman going to quote from?

Mr. BOX. I am going to quote from the hearings before the Committee on Immigration, the testimony of Mr. White, Assistant Secretary of Labor. Mr. Golder asked him:

Mr. GOLDER. Did I understand you to say, in your judgment there are about 250,000 aliens now in the United States deportable under the existing laws?

Mr. ROBE CARL WHITE. That is the judgment of the district directors, in all of the districts, which meets with my approval. I believe they are conservative in that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. When was that?

Mr. BOX. That was in 1926, on the 12th of January.

We have been deporting 11,000 to 12,000 aliens per year, at which rate we are deporting about one-twentieth of those subject to deportation.

In an article in the Congressional Digest of May, 1928, at page 151, Commissioner General Hull said:

We have many aliens who are unlawfully in the United States. Various estimates have been made as to the number, some running as high as 3,000,000. Regardless of the number, the problem presented is enormous, and the danger to our institutions is real. These aliens illegally in the country are divided into several classes—those illegally here because at the time of their entry they were not entitled to enter the United States, which include those entering surreptitiously; those securing entry by means of false and misleading statements; and those who arrived as seamen and deserted their vessels or were discharged at the port of arrival and abandoned their calling; and those who were originally lawfully admitted, but have since become public charges, or have been sentenced for the commission of one or more crimes involving moral turpitude, or have done other things in violation of our hospitality.

Among many other bad things about the conference report it gives the privilege of reentering to the hosts of its beneficiaries though the majority of them have entered illegally; it gives them the privilege of becoming citizens and confers on them the privilege of bringing a host of near relatives as nonquota immigrants. The extent of the injury done, of course, depends in part upon the number to be pardoned and naturalized and the number of new immigrants to be brought in under the legislation. A little less than five years after June 3, 1921, Commissioner General Hull testified as follows:

Mr. HULL. * * * Now, you apply that on through the number of aliens that we know are in the country, and you can make a rough guess and it will run you over 1,300,000. That, probably, is too many, but it may be right. It may be less; we do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. That would apply to all the people who are here and unable to prove legal entry into the United States?

Mr. HULL. And the payment of the head tax and inspection.

Mr. BOX. That is all prior to June 3, 1921?

Mr. HULL. They came in before June 3, 1921. (Hearings January 12, 1926, p. 31; committee hearings, 69th Cong., 1st sess., p. 179.)

He further testified that the department estimated that 250,000 more had at that time entered since June 3, 1921, but they are in a separate class and if I have time I shall show you how they are benefited under this bill and the legislation which they expect to get enacted hereafter, but this bill deals directly with the 1,300,000, more or less, designated in Commissioner Hull's testimony. Nobody knows the exact number to be benefited under this particular measure, but everybody acquainted with the subject knows that the number runs into many hundreds of thousands, and the Commissioner General of Immigration has approximated it at 1,300,000.

The bulk of these have not been examined to ascertain whether or not they have criminal records; whether they are mentally, morally, and physically inferior; whether they have met the requirements of the literacy test; whether they entered as contract laborers, and whether they have met the standards of our immigration laws as set up in the act of 1917. It is known that the bulk of them came in defiance of law. I submit that a proposition to admit them to citizenship now is a ruinous impairment of our standards of immigration and naturalization.

As bearing upon the practices of the country before alien and hyphenated influence became so powerful with politicians and Congress, I quote from annual reports made by the United States Commissioner of Naturalization dealing with the subject of naturalization and citizenship:

In his annual report for the fiscal year 1923-24, at page 11, the Commissioner of Naturalization said:

The following recommendations are strongly urged:

At the present time an alien may declare his intention to become a citizen immediately upon landing in the United States, regardless of lawful entry therein or of his ability to read, speak, or write the English language. No alien who entered the United States unlawfully should be allowed to declare his intention, particularly if he entered since May 1, 1917, the date the immigration act of February 5, 1917, became operative. * * *

On page 12 of the same report the commissioner said:

Since the recent quota law became effective an applicant who is a nonimmigrant alien and not an "immigrant" as defined in section 3 of the act of May 26, 1924, can not have residence in the United States for naturalization purposes, because he can not show admission to the United States as an immigrant alien upon an immigration visa. Such an alien should not be entitled to obtain a certificate of arrival from the manifest upon which he is recorded as entering the United States nor become naturalized. * * *

In his annual report for the fiscal year 1924-25, page 7, the Commissioner of Naturalization said:

It was early revealed in connection with the investigations under this requirement that large numbers of aliens who had entered the country illegally or who were unlawfully remaining in the United States after having entered the country for temporary periods of residence only were attempting to make declarations of intention.

Under the plan adopted by the bureau, applications from aliens arriving after June 30, are compared with the immigration visas in the custody of the Bureau of Naturalization. This requirement, it is believed, laid the foundation, at least at this point in the administration of the naturalization law, for the defeat of the attempts to become citizens by those who entered the United States in defiance of the provisions of the quota and visa restrictions of the immigration law. * * *

On page 8 of the same report, in dealing with the great number of temporary visitors who have remained in the country illegally, the Commissioner of Naturalization said:

This close cooperative action has resulted in the apprehension of many aliens temporarily in the United States who have attempted to make the declaration of intention and thereby acquire seeming rights under which to maintain permanent residence in the United States. * * *

There are reported to be in the country innumerable aliens who have entered the United States since June 3, 1921, in defiance of the immigration laws. Many of the declarations of intention now in existence will be found to be in the hands of such illegally entering aliens at the time the 5-year period of residence for naturalization purposes has expired. * * *

In addition to these, alien seamen under the La Follette law were entitled to leave their ships on arrival at American ports and seek employment in their vocation, under certain restrictions, prior to July 1, 1924, when a visa became a prerequisite to permanent lawful presence in the United States. In some cases the masters of the vessels made no report to the immigration officers, but evidently permitted the seamen to leave in all respects regularly except as to the immigration requirements. In others, seamen left their vessels without any formalities being

observed. In numbers of instances these aliens shipped in pursuit of their calling, some upon foreign-bound vessels of American or foreign registry, others on coastwise vessels, while others remained permanently ashore, taking up land vocations. Some had paid the immigration head tax, others had not. These various classes represent many thousands of aliens whose status in the United States it is difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to determine.

In his annual report for the fiscal year 1925-26, at page 16, the Commissioner of Naturalization said:

* * * Evidence is conclusive of aliens arriving in the United States in disregard of law during the period of the quota law and since the operation of the immigration act of 1924. Many have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States who have no lawful right to make such declaration, because they are in this country in defiance of the immigration laws relating to the quota and immigration visa requirements.

In his annual report for the fiscal year 1926-27, at page 10, the Commissioner of Naturalization said:

The first quota restriction law became operative on June 3, 1921. From reports, official and otherwise, it is common knowledge that there have been many aliens who have entered the United States illegally since that time. Large numbers of them have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States. As a reward for their violation of the law they are now in possession of declarations of intention not possible of attainment by other aliens not admitted to the United States lawfully.

This bill, as amended by the Copeland amendment and as presented in the conference report, ignores the difference between law-abiding immigrants and bootlegged aliens, and rewards disregard of the law. It throws citizenship and its privileges, including the ballot, into the dirt at the feet of aliens who have despised the laws and are most apt to be without capacity to appreciate or use the ballot.

As to how this bill will increase immigration during the next few years, I submit that it will do it—

First through the admission of an increased number of non-quota immigrants. Beginning a few months after the passage of this bill, these hundreds of thousands of smuggled-in aliens being pardoned and rewarded by this bill will begin to become naturalized citizens. That is one of the major rewards being paid them for their contempt of the law. After becoming naturalized citizens, each one of them will be entitled to have admitted as nonquota immigrants the classes mentioned in subdivision (a) of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924, to wit, his wife and unmarried minor children. The number of such nonquota immigrants is very great, and the number of such coming to the hundreds of thousands benefiting by this bill will be large, and—

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I regret that I can not.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The gentleman is stating his own views, and we can construe this measure in another way.

Mr. BOX. I did not yield to the gentleman, but the gentleman from Texas is not misconstruing this measure.

Second, they will be entitled to readmission under subdivision (b) of section 4 of the immigration act of 1924 when returning from a temporary visit abroad, from the very date of the beginning of the administration of this act, if passed. Every one of such who goes out can, after paying for the certificate provided for, get a permit to reenter simply because he had theretofore illegally entered. Entering thus illegally, he thereby becomes entitled to reenter; and every one who thus reenters, who could not otherwise do so, will be an addition to our alien population. Generally those favored by this bill will be the most objectionable part of the country's alien people. All of the increase thus provided under subdivisions (a) and (b) of section 4 will be nonquota, or outside the quota, immigrants and, of course, will add to the volume of our immigration to the extent of their numbers, which will be large.

In addition to the numbers that will come outside the quota will be those entitled to a preference within the quota. Under the present law the number of immigrants entitled to a preference within the quota is so large as to congest many consulates. In some countries the waiting list now extends 10 to 20 years ahead. Under the Jenkins Act, itself unobjectionable, all of the relatives of the classes named in that act of aliens lawfully admitted to the country are entitled to a preferred status within the quota. This bill will transfer some hundreds of thousands of smuggled-in aliens into the class of those legally admitted, and thus give their relatives of the classes named the preference status provided for such relatives in the Jenkins Act. This will further congest our consulates, and will be a rank injustice to naturalized citizens and aliens lawfully admitted and their

relatives in thus giving to the smuggled-in aliens and their relatives a share in the privilege of having their relatives admitted, which under the present law belongs only to citizens or aliens lawfully admitted to the country. This is unwise and wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an overstatement, and if you gentlemen see proper to take a view different from that I express to you, and that on this lack of information and immature consideration, I ask you to calmly examine this measure hereafter and see whether or not I am warranted in the statements that I make. I ask you at the same time to watch the immigration figures jump up after the passage of this bill, as soon as it has time to get in full operation.

It is the intention of those promoting this legislation, in and out of Congress, that this policy shall go forward. The Copeland amendment, passed by the Senate, provided that this date should be July 1, 1924, where June 3, 1921, now appears; and a majority of the conferees wanted that date fixed, but the chairman of the House committee was able to prevent the adoption of that date. It has been openly and repeatedly declared—I may safely say that it has been definitely determined—that at an early session of Congress this date will be brought forward to July 1, 1924.

Even when that date was yet in the Senate amendment alien and hyphenated influences, some chambers of commerce and others were protesting that the date should be brought down to now; so that while we were pardoning this 1,300,000, more or less, we should also pardon the several hundred thousand who came in thereafter up to the present in defiance of law.

When you pass this measure you will have no sound reason on which to base a refusal to pass future measures like it, so that under such a policy the many thousands who got into the country illegally, avoiding all of our wholesome immigration restrictions, can be received into the body of our citizenship and can forthwith bring their relatives as nonquota immigrants. Gentlemen, you should not pass this measure. It makes a serious breach in our immigration and naturalization laws and adopts a policy which will continue this hurtful course to still worse consequences.

Among other objectionable features of the Copeland amendment and this conference report is the preparation for a great increase in the Naturalization Bureau, with the furnishing of a great many new Federal jobs and the piling up of further bureau expenses. My information and my judgment are that the enactment of this law will soon require that the personnel of the present Naturalization Bureau be soon increased to twice its present number.

For years I and other members of the committee have been coming before this House and before the Committee on Appropriations asking for larger appropriations for the Immigration Service in order to better patrol the borders and to deport those for whose deportation the law provides. Again and again your committee has learned that the present force at the command of the Immigration Service is utterly inadequate. I have just called your attention to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Labor White there were in 1926 at least 250,000 deportable aliens in the country, while our deportations rarely reached 12,000 in number, which is less than 1 in 20 of those who ought to be deported. Now, this bill proposes that these forces which have been inadequate for the work of protecting the borders against the smuggling in of immigrants and unequal to the work of deporting any considerable portion of our bad aliens, is to be diverted from that work and put to the task of making some sort of a formal field investigation of this 1,300,000, more or less, illegally in the country in order to grant them immunity and give them citizenship. They can not do such work adequately. It is a farce to pretend that they can do it. It is much like providing that the constables or other petty officers in the outlying portions of the county shall adjudicate land suits or try other important civil or criminal cases. To ask that this work be done by the field representatives of the Immigration Service is ridiculous. It means just what the whole bill means—that the law is to be cheapened and impaired and its enforcement, already deplorably bad, made much worse.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KAHN). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOX. I have done the best I could. I wish I could tell you all that is in this bill and the extent to which it contradicts the professions of those who call themselves restrictionists but nevertheless join in this reversal of provisions of our naturalization laws and impairment of important restrictions of our immigration laws. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Madam Speaker, I hope all will understand that aliens here prior to June 3, 1921, are here and a large number of them for the reasons stated before, the failure to keep a record of entry into the United States. Now,

there was a record kept for quite a long time when applications were being made for nunc pro tunc process. In the years 1923 and 1924, after the passage of the temporary quota act, the record was between 6,000 and 7,000 alien declarants, and at that time the declarations of intention averaged 300,000 a year. To me it is a most interesting thing that in all the days following the great immigration to the United States, when it ran more than 1,000,000 a year, that the declarations of intention did not reach higher numbers, and that actual citizenship papers were issued to so few.

The present naturalization law has been in effect 23 years. In the records there are approximately 5,000,000 declarations of intention. Now, do not think I am saying that means that many are to come up. That is what we have had as to declarations of intention for 23 years, and out of that 5,000,000, 3,500,000 in the 23 years' time made petitions for naturalization and about 3,000,000 certificates of naturalization. Remember, that is in 23 years' time.

For years, as I said, efforts were made in every way possible to find some way to cure the nunc pro tunc, which is illegal, and to provide a way by law. I am not alarmed. I am as satisfied as can be, my friends, that we must have a dead line. You will remember that in the 1924 immigration restriction act the burden of proof is always on the alien, not on the United States, and if he enters surreptitiously he is deportable for all time. It is necessary to find a dead line somewhere, and that is what we are trying to do.

Madam Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington moves the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. BOX. Madam Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Does the gentleman want the yeas and nays on the previous question?

Mr. BOX. No; not on the previous question. I thank the gentleman for his correction.

The question was taken; and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is now on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BOX. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks for the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fifty-two gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, 58 being the required number.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Madam Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from Texas, as I understood it, demanded the yeas and nays and Madam Speaker counted those rising in favor of having the vote by the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Fifty-two.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And how many were present?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and eighty-seven Members were present at the last count. Fifty-eight would have been a sufficient number.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the point of order, there is not a quorum present.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. As the Speaker well knows, the Constitution of the United States provides that one-fifth of the Members present have the right to have the yeas and nays. There has not been a roll call or any count of the House, so far as I know, since we convened at 8 o'clock. On a request here for the yeas and nays, 52 rose. The Chair stated that that was not one-fifth of those present, and when the other side was asked to be counted to see if 52 was one-fifth of those present, the Chair did not count, and, therefore, I appeal to the Speaker. Under the Constitution, one-fifth of those present in the House being entitled to the yeas and nays, I asked the Speaker to ascertain if 52 is not one-fifth of those present in the House.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair announced not very long ago, after having carefully counted, that 287 Members were present. The Chair assumes there are still 287 Members present. So there was not a sufficient number. Now, a point of order is made that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Just a moment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make the point of order there is no quorum present?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withdraw that point and ask for the other side on the demand for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has before him this precedent:

Such count (meaning such count as the present occupant of the chair made long since) is not subject to verification and a request for a rising vote of those opposed to the demand is not in order.

Now, if the gentleman makes the point of order there is not a quorum present, the Chair will be delighted to count.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I withdraw that.

Mr. BOYLAN. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREEN. As much time has elapsed since the first count was taken and as the other side of the question was not put, is it not in order to request the Chair to again put the question?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, as he said before, if anybody makes a point of order there is no quorum present, will count. Now, does any body make such a point?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, to relieve any question here, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Three hundred and ten Members present, a quorum, and the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. BOX. Has the question ever been put in any way on the conference report, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the present parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary situation is that the conference report is agreed to so far as the Chair knows.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We ask for a division on that question.

The SPEAKER. A division is in order.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 218, noes 110.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JOHNSON of Washington and Mr. Box.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 154, noes 89.

So the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

ENTRY OF ALIENS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 5094) making it a felony, with penalty, for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law; and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 5094) making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That (a) if any alien has been arrested and deported in pursuance of law, he shall be excluded from admission to the United States whether such deportation took place before or after the enactment of this act, and if he enters or attempts to enter the United States after the expiration of 60 days after the enactment of this act, he shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall, unless a different penalty is otherwise expressly provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for not more than two years or by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(b) For the purposes of this section any alien ordered deported (whether before or after the enactment of this act) who has left the United States shall be considered to have been deported in pursuance of law, irrespective of the source from

which the expenses of his transportation were defrayed or of the place to which he departed.

"(c) An alien subject to exclusion from admission to the United States under this section who is employed upon a vessel arriving in the United States shall not be entitled to any of the landing privileges allowed by law to seamen.

"(d) So much of section 3 of the immigration act of 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136(j)) as reads as follows: 'persons who have been deported under any of the provisions of this act, and who may again seek admission within one year from the date of such deportation unless prior to their reembarkation at a foreign port or their attempt to be admitted from foreign contiguous territory the Secretary of Labor shall have consented to their reapplying for admission' is amended to read as follows: 'persons who have been excluded from admission and deported in pursuance of law, and who may again seek admission within one year from the date of such deportation, unless prior to their reembarkation at a place outside the United States or their attempt to be admitted from foreign contiguous territory the Secretary of Labor has consented to their reapplying for admission.'

"(e) So much of section 18 of the immigration act of 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 154), as reads as follows: 'or knowingly to bring to the United States at any time within one year from the date of deportation any alien rejected or arrested and deported under any provision of this act, unless prior to reembarkation the Secretary of Labor has consented that such alien shall reapply for admission, as required by section 3 hereof,' is amended to read as follows: 'or knowingly to bring to the United States any alien excluded or arrested and deported under any provision of law until such time as such alien may be lawfully entitled to reapply for admission to the United States.' The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect on the expiration of 60 days after the enactment of this act, but the provision amended shall remain in force for the collection of any fine incurred before the effective date of such amendment.

"SEC. 2. Any alien who hereafter enters the United States at any time or place other than as designated by immigration officials or eludes examination or inspection by immigration officials, or obtains entry to the United States by a willfully false or misleading representation or the willful concealment of a material fact, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than one year or by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 3. An alien sentenced to imprisonment shall not be deported under any provision of law until after the termination of the imprisonment. For the purposes of this section the imprisonment shall be considered as terminated upon the release of the alien from confinement, whether or not he is subject to rearrest or further confinement in respect of the same offense.

"SEC. 4. Upon the final conviction of any alien of any offense under this act in any court of record it shall be the duty of the clerk of the court to notify the Secretary of Labor, giving the name of the alien convicted, the nature of the offense of which convicted, the sentence imposed, and, if imprisoned, the place of imprisonment, and, if known, the place of birth of such alien, his nationality, and the time when and place where he entered the United States.

"SEC. 5. Terms defined in the immigration act of 1924 shall, when used in this act, have the meaning assigned to such terms in that act."

And the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

ALBERT JOHNSON,
BIRD J. VINCENT,
GEORGE J. SCHNEIDER,
A. J. SABATH,

Managers on the part of House.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM H. KING,
DAVID A. REED,
COLE L. BLEASE,
HENRY W. KEYES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 5094) making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law, submit the following

written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill made it a felony for any alien who has been arrested and deported under the immigration act of 1917 or the immigration act of 1924 to enter the United States in violation of law and provided that he should be deported at the expiration of his sentence. It further provided that the clerk of the court, upon the conviction of the alien, should notify the Secretary of Labor and also notify the marshal having the prisoner in custody who should retain the prisoner for not more than five days to enable the Secretary of Labor to arrest him for deportation. The House amendment strikes out the Senate text and reinserts it with certain perfecting amendments to which the Senate agrees. Under the provisions of the bill as agreed to in conference, if an alien has been arrested and deported he is excluded from admission to the United States and hence becomes deportable under section 19 of the immigration act of 1917.

The House amendment also added nine new grounds for deportation, together with certain provisions depending upon these deportation provisions. Under the bill, as agreed to in conference, all this matter is omitted.

The House amendment also added a section making it a criminal offense for an alien to enter the United States without inspection or at any time or place other than as designated by immigration officials, or to obtain entry by willfully false or willfully misleading representations or willfully concealment of material facts. The Senate agrees to this provision.

The House amendment also added a section having the effect of permitting deportation immediately upon the release of a criminal on parole if he is otherwise deportable. The Senate agrees to this provision.

The House amendment amended the title of the Senate bill, and the House recedes from this amendment.

ALBERT JOHNSON,
BIRD J. VINCENT,
GEORGE J. SCHNEIDER,
A. J. SABATH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that some people feel that it is easy to criticize. I am of the opinion that most of the times it is easier to approve and praise than to be obliged to point out the shortcomings and defects as I am from time to time obliged to do on the floor of the House.

The bill under consideration, however, proves beyond doubt that honest criticism is helpful and beneficial. We have now before us a bill which I am pleased I can support and vote for, because the conferees, after I had pointed out to them the many harsh, inhumane, and retroactive provisions, agreed to eliminate them, and now we have a bill that will punish real offenders and not merely unfortunates.

I only regret that my provision and amendment which aimed for the deportation of the vicious gun gangs has not been agreed to. However, I recognize that not one in a thousand of that class is an alien; but I was desirous of securing the passage of that provision more for the purpose of closing the mouths of those who continually yell and who continually are trying to unload the crime wave upon the alien, notwithstanding that in their hearts they know that these charges are false and untrue and are being repeated by them deliberately and willfully so as to create prejudice against the immigrant or the alien in the minds of the American people.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on H. R. 349, the so-called naturalization relief bill, which the chairman of the committee and many others are trying to make you and the country really believe that it is a relief bill.

I concede that it will make possible for some aliens who have entered the United States before July 1, 1921, and of whom there was no record made at the ports of entry, to offer evidence to prove that they have actually entered legally and secure the rights and privileges of becoming American citizens, after, however, complying with all the naturalization laws which, however, this act materially not only strengthens but will make rather expensive.

Now what does the bill really do? It provides, in the first place, that a man who can prove that he (1) entered the United States prior to July 3, 1921, (2) has resided in the United States continuously since such entry, (3) is a person of good moral character, and (4) is not subject to deportation, will receive a registration certificate for which he will be obliged to pay \$20 and that because the Government has failed to keep records of his entry.

After that, under section 4, which provides that upon payment of \$5 he will receive, under section 5 of the bill, a certificate of arrival, which, under section 4, is necessary, and which will be required of all aliens in the future, before being permitted to make or file his declaration of intention, and after receiving this certificate, for which he will pay this \$5, and not until then can he file his application for declaration of intention for which, instead of \$1 as now, he will be obliged to pay another \$5. Two years thereafter, if he proves he resided continuously for over two years in the United States, he will have the privilege to file a petition for citizenship and for which he will be charged \$10 instead of \$4, as under the present law, and if he is found to be entitled to be naturalized, upon payment of another \$5, he will receive a certificate of naturalization.

After he has complied with all these requirements and will be naturalized and has received a certificate of naturalization, section 32 provides that, upon payment of \$10, he can obtain a copy of his certificate if same is lost or destroyed.

Provision (b) of section 32 gives him the privilege of obtaining a special certificate of citizenship if he desires same to be used when traveling or going abroad, for which he is to pay an additional \$10, and this, in addition to the passport that is required of him and for which a fee of \$10 is charged by the State Department, but we are not through as yet with all the certificates. There are other certificates to come.

Section 33, to my mind, is the most objectionable of all. That section provides and goes much further, because it does not apply to aliens or to those who are seeking citizenship; but it also applies to approximately 3,000,000 American citizens, who became citizens by act of Congress, through the naturalization of their parents or those who became citizens by marriage before the Cable Act went into effect. And though it is not mandatory for them to obtain a certificate of their citizenship, I feel that this provision will have a tendency to force these approximately 3,000,000 American citizens to comply with this provision and obtain such certificates.

There is no doubt but that the authorities everywhere will demand and require that all naturalized citizens in the United States, including the 3,000,000 citizens made so by the law of the land, prove their citizenship by producing their certificate of citizenship, under this section, and for which they will be taxed \$10, saying nothing of the annoyances that it will subject them to.

So, to make the matter clear to all, I insert section 33 and show how far-reaching it is.

SEC. 33. (a) Any individual over 21 years of age who claims to have derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent, or a husband, may, upon the payment of a fee of \$10, make application to the Commissioner of Naturalization, accompanied by two photographs of the applicant, for a certificate of citizenship. Upon obtaining a certificate from the Secretary of Labor showing the date, place, and manner of arrival in the United States, upon proof to the satisfaction of the commissioner that the applicant is a citizen and that the alleged citizenship was derived as claimed, and upon taking and subscribing to, before a designated representative of the Bureau of Naturalization within the United States, the oath of allegiance required by the naturalization laws of a petitioner for citizenship such individual shall be furnished a certificate of citizenship by the commissioner, but only if such individual is at the time within the United States. In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home and abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States, the certificate of citizenship issued under this section shall have the same effect as a certificate of citizenship issued by a court having naturalization jurisdiction.

In addition to this the bill has several other provisions, which, however, to my mind are not of great importance, unless it be section 36, as well as the provision in section 33 which provides that from now on all applicants and all naturalized citizens will be obliged to furnish two photographs of themselves when making an application for citizenship. One of these photographs is to remain part and parcel of the record in the Bureau of Naturalization, which I greatly fear will become a bureau of registration, and from all indications much more stringent than even existed in Russia under the old Czar régime.

To my mind, if this bill is entitled to be called a relief bill it is because it relieves the alien and even the American citizens of several \$5 and \$10 bills.

These fees, to my mind, are excessive, as now, though we charge only \$1 for declarations of intention and \$2 for the application and \$2 for naturalization, there has been a profit or surplus in that bureau of over \$260,000 last year.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be deplored that a great and rich Nation like ours should be guilty of extracting these excessive fees and placing itself in a position as a profiteering Nation.

Instead of this being a relief bill it is a bill that will make in the future the naturalization not only more expensive but much harder to obtain, and notwithstanding the fact that the people responsible for this legislation criticize the immigrant or the alien that they do not become American citizens; or, in other words, first, they make naturalization nearly impossible, and then they charge that they do not care to be naturalized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I will take three or four minutes to explain this deportation bill, which is a Senate bill. The Senate bill undertook to make it a violation if the person who had been deported returned, and also if certain persons stopped at the gate and attempted to come in without permission. The House by vote added a large number of items, including seven classes. On a careful examination your conferees became convinced that we had not carefully made the distinction between those who should be deported under such conditions and those who might be under other conditions. For instance, if an alien had been in this country five years and one day, and commits a foul murder, he could not be deported under any provisions of the bill passed in this or the other body.

We had certain provisions requiring a deportation for a misdemeanor, a six months' offense. That would apply to "gun toters." The conferees concluded that such things are out of balance.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HOLADAY. What aliens can be deported under this bill that can not be deported under the present law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. All those that return after they have been once deported. The United States goes to great expense in deporting them, and they can come back with another name, perhaps, or come in as sailors and get into the country. The United States stops many at the gate of entry.

Mr. HOLADAY. Any other classes that could be deported?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have not the bill before me. We eliminated the seven classes that were in the bill.

Mr. HOLADAY. I am not interested in what you dropped; but I am interested in what you have in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is a starter, and it is all we were able to get. I believe that it is important to amend the deportation clauses of the law of '17 rather than to undertake to write a new deportation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. It seems by the support of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and the answers by the gentleman from Washington, that this is a very innocuous deportation bill. Is the House to understand that in the next session we are to get a real deportation bill? The gentleman's committee has been working on this for six or eight years, and I am surprised to hear that they did not have it in proper form; that they were not able to accomplish anything. I think it is time we had a real deportation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentlemen will help us, we will have one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the history of deportation legislation during the last two or three years would be interesting to you if you stopped to consider it. During the Sixty-ninth Congress the House passed a substantial deportation bill. It went to the other body but did not pass. It was never acted upon, I think. During the first session of this Congress a milder bill, sort of denatured proposition, was reported in the hope that it might pass. It had too much vigor in it and was too much out of line with the vote here to-night, and could not get consideration in the House. Then as a kind of offset to this measure and, in my judgment, for the purpose of camouflaging the situation and diverting attention from the action on the bill that you have just voted on, a few things were thrown together very immaturely, all of them out of proportion, and brought in here as an offset against this outrageous measure that has just passed. That measure passed. I supported it because it had some good in it. But gentlemen who want deportation will have to understand that the matter must be gone about in earnest by people who want it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I regret I can not yield. This last bill that you have just passed provides that it is a felony to do the very thing for which you grant citizenship in the other bill. For having committed a felony you give him the reward of citizen-

ship and the right to bring in hundreds of thousands, perhaps, of his alien kinsmen in the other bill, and say in this one that such a scoundrel shall be guilty of a felony and go to prison as such. When talking about what you are going to do with a man who shall hereafter enter the country illegally, you say you are going to treat him like the felon that he is; but when he and his hyphenated and alien sympathizers are already in the country, most of them illegally, you say he is a good man, entitled to sympathy, and should be given citizenship and the privilege of bringing in his relatives, all of whom, taken together, will amount to many thousands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

J. H. B. WILDER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be respectfully requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5715) entitled "An act for the relief of J. H. B. Wilder."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Senate?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia objects, and the Clerk will so inform the Senate.

WILLIAM S. WELCH

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be respectfully requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2127) entitled "An act for the relief of William S. Welch, trustee of the estate of the Joliet Forge Co., of Joliet, Ill., bankrupt."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate will be complied with.

There was no objection.

PILGRIMAGE TO EUROPEAN CEMETERIES

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5332), to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries, now on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 5332, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to arrange for pilgrimages to cemeteries in Europe by mothers and widows of members of the military or naval forces of the United States who died in the military or naval service at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 1, 1921, and whose remains are now interred in such cemeteries. Such pilgrimages shall be made at the expense of the United States under the conditions set forth in section 2.

Sec. 2. The conditions under which such pilgrimages may be made are as follows:

(a) Invitations to make the pilgrimages shall be extended in the name of the United States to the mothers and widows for whom the pilgrimages are authorized to be arranged under section 1.

(b) Upon acceptance of the invitation the mother or widow shall be entitled to make one such pilgrimage; but no mother or widow who has previous to the pilgrimage visited cemeteries described in section 1 shall be entitled to make any such pilgrimage, and no mother or widow shall be entitled to make more than one such pilgrimage.

(c) The pilgrimages shall be made at such times during the period from May 1, 1930, to October 31, 1933, as may be designated by the Secretary of War.

(d) For the purpose of the pilgrimages the Secretary of State shall (1) issue special passports, limited to the duration of the pilgrimage, to mothers and widows making the pilgrimages and to such personnel as may be selected to accompany and/or arrange for the pilgrimages, if such mothers, widows, and personnel are citizens of the United States, and (2) issue suitable travel documents, if aliens. No fee for either of such documents or for any application therefor shall be charged. Such alien mothers, widows, and personnel shall be permitted to return and be granted admission to the United States without regard to any law,

convention, or treaty relating to the immigration or exclusion of aliens, if the return is made within the period covered by the pilgrimage of the particular group or, in the case of personnel, within such times as the Secretary of War shall by regulation prescribe; except that in any case of unavoidable detention the Secretary of War may extend in such case the time during which return may be made without regard to such laws, conventions, or treaties.

(e) The pilgrimages shall be by the shortest practicable route and for the shortest practicable time, to be designated by the Secretary of War. No mother or widow shall be provided for at Government expense in Europe for a longer period than two weeks from the time of disembarkation in Europe to the time of reembarkation in Europe. In the case of any mother or widow wilfully failing to continue the pilgrimage of her particular group, the United States shall not incur or be subject to any expense with regard to her pilgrimage after such failure.

(f) Vessels owned or operated by the United States Government or any agency thereof shall be used for transportation at sea wherever practicable.

(g) Suitable transportation, accommodations, meals, and other necessities pertaining thereto, as prescribed by the Secretary of War, shall be furnished each mother or widow included in any pilgrimage for the entire distance at sea and on land and while sojourning in Europe and while en route in the United States from home to port and from port to home. Cabin-class accommodations shall be furnished for all transportation at sea. No mother or widow shall be entitled, by reason of any payment made by or for her, to be furnished by the Government with transportation, accommodations, meals, and other necessities pertaining thereto different in kind from those prescribed by the Secretary of War for the pilgrimage of the particular group.

(h) All pilgrimages shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of War may from time to time prescribe as to the time, route, itineraries, composition of groups, accommodations, transportation, program, arrangements, management, and other matters pertaining to such pilgrimages.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act. The Secretary of War is directed to make an investigation for the purpose of determining (1) the total numbers of mothers and widows entitled to make the pilgrimages, (2) the number of such mothers and widows who desire to make the pilgrimages and the number who desire to make the pilgrimages during the calendar year 1930, and (3) the probable cost of the pilgrimages to be made. The Secretary of War shall report to the Congress not later than December 15, 1929, the results of such investigation.

SEC. 4. As used in this act—

(a) The term "mother" means mother, stepmother, mother through adoption, or any woman who stood in loco parentis to the deceased member of the military or naval forces for the year prior to the commencement of his service in such forces.

(b) The term "widow" means a widow who has not remarried since the death of the member of the military or naval forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH LEE

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4244, for the relief of Joseph Lee, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4244, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment. The clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

PENSIONS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill H. R. 16878, an omnibus pension bill, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up a conference report upon the bill H. R. 16878, an omnibus pension bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16878) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain

soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language proposed in the Senate engrossed amendment insert the following: Page 4, paragraph 3:

"The name of Mary C. Von Ezdorf, widow of Rudolph H. Von Ezdorf, late assistant surgeon, United States Public Health Service, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
J. M. ROBSON,
WM. C. HAMMER,

Managers on the part of the House.

ARTHUR R. ROBINSON,
PETER NORBECK,
DANIEL F. STECK,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House on H. R. 16878 show by way of explanation that 90 items were included in said bill, 61 from the House and 29 from the Senate.

The committee of conference carefully examined the merits of each individual case over which any difference of opinion existed, and mutually agreed to restore all bills of meritorious character.

HAROLD KNUTSON,
JOHN M. ROBSON,
WM. C. HAMMER,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

TREATY BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND LOYAL SHAWNEE INDIANS

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5127) to carry into effect the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Loyal Shawnee Indians, proclaimed October 14, 1868, on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5127) which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand it is agreeable to the gentleman interested in the bill to insert an amendment fixing the attorney's fee at 5 per cent instead of 10 per cent. With that understanding I do not object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5127) to carry into effect the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Loyal Shawnee Indians proclaimed October 14, 1868

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$109,746.25, and the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay said sum to the Indians of the Loyal Shawnee Tribe, their heirs, or legal representatives, in accordance with the official findings, arbitration award, and report of the Secretary of the Interior to Congress made in pursuance of the twelfth article of the treaty between the United States and the Loyal Shawnee Indians, proclaimed October 14, 1868 (15 Stat. L. 513); which claims are similar to but not included with those of the Shawnee Indians for whom an appropriation was made by act of December 22, 1927 (Public. No. 2, 70th Cong., 1st sess.): *Provided*, That out of said sum there shall be paid to the duly authorized attorney for said Indians, as evidenced by contracts executed by said Indian claimants or their then living heirs, during the years 1903, 1904, and 1905, 10 per cent of the above amount in full satisfaction of such contract or contracts: *And provided further*, That before payment of the amount hereby authorized to be appropriated the Indian beneficiaries or their legal representatives entitled to said awards shall execute in writing a receipt, release, and relinquishment of any and all claims arising under the twelfth article of said treaty which they may have against the United States.

A committee of five male adult members of the Loyal Shawnee Tribe, to be selected under direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with its headquarters at Vinita, Okla., shall execute a release on behalf of all beneficiaries having no legal representatives.

With committee amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "*Provided*," strike out all of lines 7 to 17, inclusive, and the word "*State*," at the beginning of line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there shall be paid to the duly authorized attorneys of said respective Loyal Shawnee Indians, their duly proven and established heirs, or their attorneys in fact, 10 per cent of the amount due on the respective claims of said Indians against the Government, when said Indians' right to receive payment is established: *And provided further*, That before payment of the amount due said Loyal Shawnee Indian or his heirs or assigns or to their duly authorized attorneys, receipt shall be executed by or on behalf of said Indian claimants, or their legal representatives, acknowledging payment of their claim against the United States, which receipt shall be approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 20, strike out "ten" and insert "five."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment to the committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 20, strike out the figure "10" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "5."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LAW CLERKS TO UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill H. R. 9054 be taken up and considered by the House under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 9054. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9054) to amend section 118 of the Judicial Code to provide for the appointment of law clerks to United States circuit judges

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code be, and it is hereby, amended by the addition of the following section:

"Sec. 118a. Each United States circuit judge is hereby authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General, to appoint a law clerk, whose salary shall be at a rate not in excess of \$3,000 per annum; and the appropriation of such amount as is or may be necessary to pay the salaries and travel expenses of such law clerks is hereby authorized."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

BUILDING FOR THE NATIONAL MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION (INC.) IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 132, a similar House bill being on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) to create a commission to secure plans and designs for and to erect a memorial building for the National Memorial Association (Inc), in the city of Washington, as a tribute to the negro's contribution to the achievements of America

Resolved, etc., That a commission is hereby created, composed of 15 members, of whom the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be ex officio members, the 12 additional members to be appointed by the President, to be known as National Memorial Commission, to procure and determine upon a location, plans, and designs for a memorial building suitable for meetings of patriotic organizations, public ceremonial events, the exhibition of art and inventions, and placing statues and tablets, for the National Memorial Association (Inc), in the city of Washington, as a tribute to the Negro's contribution to the achievements of America.

SEC. 2. That the construction of the memorial herein and hereby authorized shall be upon such site as shall be determined by the commission herein created and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and said construction shall be entered upon as speedily as practicable after the plan and design therefor is determined and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and shall be prosecuted to completion, under the direction of said commission and the supervision of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, under a contract or contracts as may be authorized to be entered into by said commission in a total sum not less than \$500,000, which sum shall be provided by voluntary contributions, under auspices of the National Memorial Association (Inc.), in accordance with plans to be authorized by said commission.

SEC. 3. That in the discharge of its duties herein said commission is hereby authorized to employ the services of such artists, sculptors, architects, and others as it shall determine to be necessary, and avail itself of the services or advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and the Architect of the Capitol.

SEC. 4. That vacancies occurring in the membership of the commission shall be filled by appointment by the President of the United States.

SEC. 5. That to defray the necessary expenses of the commission herein created, and the cost of procuring plans and designs, site, and other incidentals necessary to the construction for a memorial building as herein provided, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds available in the United States Treasury, a sum not exceeding \$50,000, to be available when the sum of \$500,000 shall have been collected and paid into the hands of the National Memorial Association (Inc.), for purposes in this act provided.

SEC. 6. That said commission shall from time to time submit to Congress a detailed statement as to the progress of the work.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I demand a second.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] will please take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 104, noes 62.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-five Members are present, a quorum. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has 20 minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Tennessee yields the floor at this time, this will be the unfinished business when we convene to-morrow, and the gentleman from Tennessee will have the same status as he has now?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, from the information I have just received of the death of a colleague, I yield the floor.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9285) entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States on account of property damages, personal injury, or death," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McMASTER, Mr. WATERMAN, and Mr. BAYARD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 4354. An act for the relief of Atlantic Refining Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, owner of the American steamship *H. C. Folger*, against U. S. S. *Connecticut*; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4809. An act for the relief of John B. Meisinger and Nannie Belle Meisinger; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5493. An act relating to the construction of a chapel at the Federal Industrial Institution for Women, at Alderson, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 5715. An act for the relief of J. H. B. Wilder; to the Committee on Claims.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6687. An act to change the title of the United States Court of Customs Appeals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12351. An act amending section 72 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 145), by changing the boundaries of the divisions of the southern district of California and terms of court for each division;

H. R. 13752. An act to provide for the construction of a children's tuberculosis sanatorium;

H. R. 13981. An act to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases;

H. R. 16954. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Camp Manufacturing Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Chowan River, in Gates and Hertford Counties, N. C.;

H. R. 16955. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Camp Manufacturing Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across the Meherrin River, in Hertford County, N. C.;

H. R. 7244. An act for the relief of Mary Martin Harrison;

H. R. 13593. An act to legalize a bridge across the Fox River at East Dundee, Ill.; and

H. R. 16701. An act to provide for the payment of rental to the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans of the property known as the New Orleans Army Supply Base, New Orleans, La.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ROYAL H. WELLER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of a distinguished Member of this body from the city of New York, the Hon. ROYAL H. WELLER. I send to the Speaker's desk a resolution and ask that the House adjourn out of memory of our colleague, Mr. WELLER.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 346

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. ROYAL H. WELLER, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 2, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

S72. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a bill modifying the terms of section 8 (relief of contractors) of an act approved March 4, 1925, and entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," the act directing the Secretary of the Navy to examine claims; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S73. A letter from the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, transmitting its annual report to Congress covering operations during the year of 1928 (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

S74. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Woodbridge Creek, N. J., for a 10-foot channel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 5493. An act relating to the construction of a chapel at the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 17293. A bill to authorize an appropriation for construction at Fort McKinley, Portland, Me.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WASON: Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 2796). Ordered printed.

Mr. WASON: Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Veterans' Bureau (Rept. No. 2797). Ordered printed.

Mr. STALKER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 15731. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening, extension, widening, or straightening, in accordance with the highway plan of other streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 30, 1925; without amendment (Rept. No. 2805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11105. A bill to provide for appointing Robert J. Burton, a former field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, a warrant officer, United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 2793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 17177. A bill for the relief of Charles N. Neal; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 4354. A bill for the relief of Atlantic Refining Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, owner of the American steamship *H. C. Folger*, against U. S. S. *Connecticut*; without amendment (Rept. No. 2795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GLYNN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 13353. A bill to authorize the President to reinstate Guy H. B. Smith, formerly captain, Fourth United States Infantry, in the Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 2800). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 4809. An act for the relief of John B. Meisinger and Nannie Belle Meisinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 2804). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. S. 5715. An act for the relief of J. H. B. Wilder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LETTS: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10242. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo A. Bailey; adverse (Rept. No. 2798). Laid on the table.

Mr. LETTS: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10741. A bill to provide for a final settlement of the claims of J. F. McMurray and J. F. McMurray as assignee of Mansfield, McMurray & Cornish against the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations or Tribes of Indians for legal services rendered and expenses incurred; adverse (Rept. No. 2799). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 17311) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cairo, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 17312) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make surveys of representative farm areas each year in each State for the purpose of obtaining and publishing information upon the economic condition of agricul-

ture throughout the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 17313) authorizing those qualified for admission to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to receive medical care and attention at hospitals in connection with said homes without becoming a member of such home or a patient in such hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17314) to amend paragraph 6 of section 202 of the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17315) to authorize an additional appropriation for Fort McArthur, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17316) to provide Fort McArthur, Calif., with 11 additional railroad heavy artillery guns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 17317) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1925; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 433) to permit the Citizens' Association of Chevy Chase, D. C., to erect a memorial in memory of Francis G. Newlands; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing Congress for the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to protect the livestock industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing Congress for such legislation as may be necessary to protect the beet-sugar industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the national origins clause of the Federal immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing Congress to enact such legislation as will permit the owner of land in the upper Milk River irrigation districts to enter into contracts permitting payment for the St. Marys diversion charges to be made in 40 years, and to allow deduction of nonproductive land; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SELVIG: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress of the United States to establish a 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting Congress of the United States for the enactment as may be necessary to protect the beet-sugar industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINTER: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, requesting Congress of the United States to increase the tariff on turkey and sugar industries of Wyoming and other States interested in such industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KVALE: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress of the United States to establish a 9-foot channel on the upper Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Memorial of the State legislature and the people of the State of Montana, expressing the desire for Congress to take into further consideration the resolution heretofore introduced in both bodies of Congress relating to an amendment to the Constitution respecting the time at which the President and Vice President and Members of Congress shall assume their official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAVITT: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting Congress of the United States to enact such legislation that may be necessary to protect the livestock industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting Congress of the United States to enact such legislation that may be necessary to protect the beet-sugar industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, urging Congress to enact such legislation as will permit the owners of land in the upper Milk River irrigation districts to enter into contracts permitting payments for the St. Marys diversion charges to be made in 40 years and to allow deduction on nonproductive land; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting of Congress the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to protect the livestock industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 17318) for the relief of Luther W. Guerin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 17319) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta M. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 17320) granting a pension to Samantha Vose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 17321) granting a pension to John Gillis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

13568. By Mr. BACON: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, in opposition to any restriction or limitation to the free movement of products between the United States and its Philippine possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

13569. By Mr. COLTON: Petition of six citizens of Gunnison, Utah, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78) or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

13570. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Los Angeles County Council of the United Veterans of the Republic, favoring the cruiser bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

13571. By Mr. LANKFORD: Petition of 60 members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Peru, Ohio, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

13572. Also, petition of the pastor and 100 members of the Church of the Master, Peru, Ohio, urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

13573. Also, petition of 84 members of the Main Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Kokomo, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation to protect the people of the Nation's Capital in their enjoyment of Sunday as a day of rest in seven, as provided in the Lankford bill (H. R. 78), or similar measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

13574. By Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska: Petition signed by Hon. Harry N. Wallace, Hartington, Nebr., and 102 other citizens of Cedar County, pleading for the passage of House bill 14676, granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

13575. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of Flint, Mich., urging that no change be made in the present tariff on hides and leather; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

13576. Also, petition of citizens of the sixth district of Michigan, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the compulsory Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

13577. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3116, the 44-hour week bill; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

13578. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Paper Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the LaGuardia bill (H. R. 10287); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

13579. Also, petition of the Bristol-Myers Co., New York, favoring the passage of the LaGuardia bill (H. R. 10287); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

13580. Also, petition of the Toy Manufacturers of the United States of America, favoring the passage of the LaGuardia bill (H. R. 10287); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

13581. Also, petition of the Corset and Brassiere Association of New York, favoring the passage of the LaGuardia bill (H. R. 10287); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

13582. By Mr. PRATT: Memorializing a colleague from New York, Hon. Thaddeus C. Sweet; to the Committee on the Library.

13583. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of Catholic Daughters of America, relating to the national-origins clause of the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

SATURDAY, March 2, 1929

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1929)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edwards	King	Shortridge
Barkley	Fess	McKellar	Simmons
Bayard	Fletcher	McMaster	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	McNary	Smoot
Black	George	Mayfield	Steck
Blaine	Gerry	Metcalf	Stelwer
Blease	Glass	Moses	Stephens
Borah	Glenn	Neely	Swanson
Bratton	Goff	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Greene	Nye	Trammell
Bruce	Hale	Oddie	Tydings
Burton	Harris	Overman	Tyson
Capper	Harrison	Pine	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hastings	Pittman	Wagner
Copeland	Hawes	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hayden	Reed, Pa.	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Dale	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Deneen	Jones	Sackett	Watson
Dill	Kendrick	Schall	Wheeler
Edge	Keyes	Sheppard	

Mr. BLAINE. My colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. LARRAZOLO] are detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

House Joint Resolution 1

A concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass and the President to approve at this session House Resolution 14665, by COLTON, as amended

Whereas there is now pending before the Seventieth Congress, second session, House Resolution 14665, by COLTON, as amended, entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas the purpose of said House Resolution 14665 as amended, is to authorize the appropriation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the construction of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations:

The sum of \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929;

The sum of \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930;

The sum of \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931; and

Whereas the State of Montana has 1,183 miles on 56 routes on their forest highways of which 178 miles are improved, 146 graded, and 858 miles unimproved, the estimated cost of completing the total forest highway system in Montana to a standard adequate for traffic and to compare with State and Federal aid style of construction is \$13,418,892, while our present annual appropriation in Montana for forest highway construction is but \$350,000; and